This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Trans. 971 ex. 15
1915

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

CONDUCTED BY

Members of the Church of England.

FOR

THE YEAR 1875.

LONDON:
WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY,
HOLLES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE;
AND AVE MARIA LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.DCCC.LXXV.

Digitized by Google

BODLEIAN
P
LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THE year eighteen hundred and seventy-five is drawing to its close. It has not been marked with any very remarkable events in our domestic politics. The Session of Parliament was neither fruitful in great measures, nor conspicuous for party excitement; still there is reason to hope that some useful legislation was accomplished. No serious opposition has been attempted to the Government of Mr. Disraeli, and had it not been for untoward blunders the year would have had no parliamentary history to record. The anxiety which is often concentrated on politics has been transferred to the havoc caused by seasons unusually tempestuous. Floods of rain, repeated and persistent, have made the late year quite exceptional in meteorological annals; not only in England, but in many other quarters of the world it has been of the most disastrous character. It is not therefore without considerable gloom and depression that the year is closing in upon us.

Uneventful, however, as our home affairs have been, there have been causes for much anxiety abroad. What has been virtually anarchy in China has nearly involved us in war in those distant regions, and the collapse of Turkey financially, is bringing forward once more the "Eastern question" in a manner calculated to evoke much apprehension. Still there has been no general war on the Continent; previous exhaustion, the results of which are felt by the victors as well as by the vanquished, has perforce compelled peace; for the wretched prolongation of strife in Spain, fatal as it is to the well-being of the country, can hardly be dignified by the title of war; it is more akin to brigandage.

The comparative torpor in the political world has been reflected in the religious. Apparently in consequence of the re-organisation of our system of judicature, and the changes

Digitized by Google

which have been imminent in the Judges before whom ecclesiastical causes are to be tried, the Act for Regulating Public Worship, passed in the previous year, has not yet been put into active operation. It would be a matter for great rejoicing if through the good sense of the clergy abandoning foolish and repulsive innovations, it could be allowed virtually to become a dead letter; but this we fear is hopeless. There are no symptoms that the Romanizing party within the Church is ceasing from its unscrupulous intrigues: if lawlessness continues it must perforce be restrained by law. Upon the Continent, in France especially, the most strenuous endeavours are being used to propagate the wildest extravagances of Ultramontanism, and to bring the nation yet more completely under the dominion of Rome. To a very considerable extent these efforts have been successful in France, but not with the other nations of Europe. In Bavaria the Papacy has received a severe rebuff, and even Spain has not been as compliant as was perhaps anticipated by the Curia.

Altogether, while the year has been barren of those great events which form landmarks in history, there has been to attentive observers, especially to those who view events as they transpire in the light of God's Word, much to cause serious anxiety for the future. There has been a more than usually rapid hastening on of events predicted with sufficient clearness, indicating an approaching end,—we do not say of this world, but of the present order and dispensation of things. The expulsion of the Turk from Europe cannot, notwithstanding the mutual jealousy of surrounding nations, be now an event in a far distant future. It follows with marvellous rapidity upon the overthrow of the Papacy as a temporal power, almost as though there were some mysterious link uniting in their fortunes these ancient enemies and oppressors of spiritual Christianity. Their opposition may yet be formidable, notwithstanding the overthrow of their earthly dominion, but it must henceforth be of a different character perhaps yet undeveloped. Much, however, that has hitherto let has been taken out of the way. In the face of these things it is hard to refrain from asking how much longer "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles," and how much time is yet to elapse before "the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled"? Events of wonderful importance may yet

Digitized by Google

transpire before the accomplishment of these things, but no devout student of the Word of God can disembarrass memory of these thoughts when he glances back for a short period, and, in the light of what has occurred and is occurring, seeks to read what will be apparently a proximate future.

As regards ourselves, the completion of the labours of another year requires from us some brief record of the past. It has been a period of considerable anxiety, for an experiment has been tried which was novel to the propietors of the *Christian Observer*. When the amalgamation with the *Christian Advocate* took place there was a serious reduction made in the new combined periodical, which could only be compensated by a largely increased circulation. This has been attained to a considerable extent, but if Evangelical Churchmen wish that which is now their sole representative to take the place in literature to which it ought to aspire, the Scripture precept should be borne in mind: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." During the past year many writers of high distinction in the Church of England have enriched the pages of the *Christian Observer* with their contributions, to whom we feel most grateful; but to command a constant supply of first-rate articles liberal remuneration is indispensable. This can only spring from wide circulation of the Magazine, and we appeal, not without confidence, to our friends to help it still further forward. High Churchmen and Broad Churchmen have felt the importance of having a vehicle for the expressing of their sentiments, and have united to produce a new *Church Quarterly Review*. It would be invidious in us to comment upon a new contemporary, which after all will stand or fall by its own intrinsic merits; but it is quite plain that it is not, and never will be, the organ of those principles which Evangelical men hold dear. Nor would it be desirable that their views should be promulgated in a chance medley of opinions, from many of which they would most strenuously differ. The recent practice adopted in some other magazines of admitting the lucubrations of the most conflicting writers is of most questionable tendency, and can only promote the confusion of truth with error. The millennial period has not yet arrived when the lion can lie down with the lamb, and when playing with the cockatrice may be a harmless amusement. Even,

Digitized by Google

however, if it were, it would be no easy matter for Evangelical men to vindicate their opinions in pages bristling with hostility to them.

We would therefore venture to submit that there never was a period when it was more important that Evangelical men should have free access to the press, and through it the means of disseminating their opinions on the many important questions which are now agitating men's minds. Religious topics are not now matters of indifference: they are discussed in every intelligent circle, and are the theme of our leading journals; they affect the course of politics, and form serious items in the deliberations of statesmen. There is no reason beyond fatal supineness why the influence formerly exercised by periodical literature should not still be wielded by Evangelical writers. When the *Christian Observer* was first called into existence the pulpit throughout England, whether among Churchmen or Dissenters, with rare exceptions, did not teach the Gospel. To a large extent it now does, and there might seem less necessity for the comments of the press. But mighty as is the influence of the pulpit, it would be unwise not to supplement it by that which may be perused thoughtfully in the study, or socially in the family circle, especially when fundamental truths are unceasingly called into question. The preacher cannot be always engaged in controversy if he would duly feed the flock committed to his charge. Still the errors of the day must be controverted, and this not only by learned and laborious works, but by statements adapted as far as possible to ordinary readers, in a brief and concise manner. It is not always practicable to treat these questions in a light way; the result would only be superficiality. Grave and important questions affecting the foundations of religious truth need corresponding treatment.

With these remarks we dismiss another volume, and in girding ourselves up to fresh effort ask not only the sympathy and support, but also the prayers of Christian friends, that we may be upheld in our endeavours to discharge faithfully the solemn trust reposed in us, so that there may not be found in the pages of the *Christian Observer and Advocate* any statement contrary to sound doctrine, tending to promote idle superstition, or to impeach the integrity of God's Holy Word.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

JANUARY.

		Page
1.	Address to our Readers	1
2.	On Baptism. By the Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury	3
3.	Last Journals of David Livingstone	14
4.	On the Disestablishment of the Irish Church	25
5.	John Stuart Mill on Nature, etc.	40
6.	The Greatest of the Prophets	51
7.	Kalisch and Leviticus	54
8.	Christmas Books	70
9.	Notices of Books	75
10.	Public Affairs	79

FEBRUARY.

1.	On Worship. By the Rev. John Richardson	81
2.	A Quiet Corner of England	87
3.	Non Progredi, Est Regredi	92
4.	Bailey's Life of Thomas Fuller	100
5.	On the Disestablishment of the Irish Church	113
6.	The Greville Memoirs	122
7.	Ritualists at their Devotions	140
8.	Notices of Books	154
9.	Public Affairs	159

MARCH.

1.	Confession and Absolution. By the Rev. William Harrison	161
2.	Memoir of the Right Rev. Robert Daly, D.D.	171
3.	Supernatural Religion	177
4.	Cornwall in its Religious Aspect	195
5.	Clerical Policy of the Nineteenth century	203
6.	The Pilgrim Psalms	210
7.	Four Years' Experience of Disestablishment	215
8.	James Everett: a Biography	226
9.	In Memoriam. Dean Champneys	231
10.	Notices of Books	234
11.	Public Affairs	238

APRIL.

		Page
1.	The Believer's Standing	241
2.	The Ritual Controversy	246
3.	Days Near Rome	267
4.	"L'Antichrist," par Ernest Renan	275
5.	Latent Scepticism	288
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews	296
7.	An Expositor's Note-book	310
8.	Correspondence	313
9.	Notices of Books	314
10.	Public Affairs	319

MAY.

1.	The Believer: Complete, yet Incomplete	321
2.	Promenade autour du Monde	327
3.	The Ritual Controversy	342
4.	Babylone et La Chaldee	368
5.	"L'Antichrist," par Ernest Renan. Letter II.	373
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. II.	382
7.	Churchyard Thoughts. A Fragment	392
8.	Correspondence	395
9.	Notices of Books	396
10.	Public Affairs	398

JUNE.

1.	The Attractions of Error	401
2.	On Fasting Communion	410
3.	Mr. Kinglake's Battle of Inkerman	420
4.	On Self-consecration	429
5.	Dean Mansel on Gnostic Heresies	438
6.	The Covenanted Presence of Christ	448
7.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. III.	454
8.	"L'Antichrist," par Ernest Renan. Letter III.	463
9.	Notices of Books	475
10.	Public Affairs	479

Digitized by Google

JULY.

		Page
1.	Sanctification	481
2.	Behari Day's Govinda Samanta	486
3.	MacColl's Lawlessness of Ritualism	507
4.	The Establishment of an Institution for the Theological Preparation of the Clergy	522
5.	Bishop Douglas' Charge	532
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. IV.	539
7.	McClellan's New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ	549
8.	Notices of Books	556
9.	Public Affairs	559

AUGUST.

1.	The Word	561
2.	Autobiography of Thomas Guthrie, D.D.	573
3.	The Professional Instruction of the Clergy	580
4.	Forgery the Basis of the Papal Power	589
5.	Relation of Evangelical Churchmen to Currents of Religious Thought	598
6.	Sermons: Miscellaneous	607
7.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. V.	614
8.	On the Proposed Revision of the Authorized Version	620
9.	Notices of Books	634
10.	Public Affairs	638

SEPTEMBER.

1.	The Principles of the Christian Ministry, with Reference to the Circumstances of the Day	641
2.	What does it Mean? "Is the Church of England worth Preserving?"	653
3.	East India (Famine)	667
4.	The Philosophy of Natural Theology	686
5.	Pilgrim Memories	693
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. VI.	697
7.	A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke	707
8.	Notices of Books	715
9.	Public Affairs	719

OCTOBER.

		Page
1.	On Preaching to the Uneducated	721
2.	Dr. Swainson's History of the Creeds	728
3.	The Holy Bible	750
4.	Tennyson's Queen Mary	761
5.	Garbett's Obligations of Truth in Religious Controversy. Evangelical Principles	764
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. VII.	771
7.	A Plea for the Supernatural in Joshua X.	780
8.	In Memoriam. Rev. E. B. Elliott	787
9.	Correspondence	793
10.	Notices of Books	796
11.	Public Affairs	799

NOVEMBER.

1.	On Missions, and the best mode of Conducting Them	801
2.	Dr. Swainson's History of the Creeds	808
3.	Mr. R. Pearsall Smith	830
4.	Professor Tyndall	841
5.	St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon	860
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews. No. VIII.	865
7.	Notices of Books	876
8.	Public Affairs	879

DECEMBER.

1.	The "Rest" on the Seventh Day	881
2.	Supernatural Religion	888
3.	The Holy Bible	900
4.	The New Reformation	911
5.	Mr. R. Pearsall Smith	916
6.	The Sacrificial System of the Jews No. IX.	926
7.	Murphy on the Book of Psalms	938
8.	Obituary. John Elliot Wilson, of Cranbrook	940
9.	Notices of Books	944
10.	Public Affairs	947

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 1. JANUARY. [1875.

ADDRESS.

In these troublous times, when the fundamental truths of Christianity and the authority of the Word of God are openly assailed; when, moreover, Romanism without and within the Church is causing much distress and perplexity, it seems to be a matter of more importance than ever that there should be a Periodical through which the friends of Evangelical truth can defend their position, and promulgate their opinions in more elaborate statements than the columns of a religious journal can admit.

Such a medium has been presented in the *Christian Observer*, which, for upwards of seventy years, under the management of Zachary Macaulay, Rev. S. C. Wilks, Dean Goode, Rev. J. W. Cunningham, and others, including last but not least, Henry Venn, has faithfully supported the true Scriptural principles of the Church of England, and defended its claims as a National Church, taking its stand on the truths of the Reformation, as recovered and enforced in that great religious movement which restored life and vigour to the Church of England in the last generation.

In this effort the *Christian Advocate and Review* has, for the last thirteen years, taken its share. It was established, in the words of its first Preface, "To meet error by truth, the teachings of mere reason by the statement of revealed truth." The two periodicals have been fellow-workers in the same cause, and have drawn their resources, in some degree, from the same quarters. By the counsel of many friends an amalgamation has now been effected; which will, it is hoped, unite all Evangelical men in the public defence of their principles, and enlist sympathy and support from all.

For the success of this undertaking we appeal to the men of the present generation who inherit the principles of our Evangelical forefathers, and are zealous, as they were, for the maintenance of Protestant Christianity.

Digitized by Google

We therefore solicit the favour of your interest and sympathy in upholding and recommending the extension of what will be hereafter the

"CHRISTIAN OBSERVER AND ADVOCATE."

By the promotion of its circulation in families and Book Clubs, its usefulness could be extended, and the services of a high class of writers could be enlisted in addition to those already engaged. Superior remuneration might then be offered, and more vigorous efforts made to advocate those essential doctrines for which our Reformers struggled and our Martyrs died.

The New Serial will consist of eighty pages, of the same size as those of the *Christian Observer*, and will be sold for ONE SHILLING; if the circulation warrants it the size of the Magazine may be subsequently enlarged.

CHICHESTER.
R. PAYNE SMITH, *Dean of Canterbury.*
FRANCIS CLOSE, *Dean of Carlisle.*
ARCHIBALD BOYD, *Dean of Exeter.*
HENRY LAW, *Dean of Gloucester.*
W. WELDON CHAMPNEYS, *Dean of Lichfield.*
HUGH M'NEILE, *Dean of Ripon.*
WILLIAM CARUS, *Canon of Winchester.*
EDWARD AURIOL, *Prebendary of St. Paul's.*
JOHN VENN, *Prebendary of Hereford.*
DANIEL WILSON, *Prebendary of St. Paul's.*
W. R. FREMANTLE, *Hon. Canon of Oxford.*
CHARLES CLAYTON, *Hon. Canon of Ripon.*
EDWARD HOARE, *Hon. Canon of Canterbury.*
J. C. RYLE, *Hon. Canon of Norwich.*
EDWARD GARBETT, *Vicar of Christ Church, Surbiton.*
SAMUEL GARRATT, *Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ipswich.*
HENRY WRIGHT, *Hon. Secretary to the Church Missionary Society.*
GORDON CALTHROP, *Vicar of St. Augustine, Highbury New Park.*
W. HARRISON, *Rector of Birch.*
E. H. BICKERSTETH, *Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead.*
C. F. S. MONEY, *Vicar of St. John's, Deptford.*
EDMUND HOLLOND, *Rector of Benhall.*
FRANCIS MAUDE, *Captain R.N.*
BENJAMIN SHAW.
JOSEPH HOARE.
C. J. BEVAN.
R. C. BEVAN

Digitized by Google

EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES.—BAPTISM.

We are taught in the Church Catechism that two sacraments only are generally necessary to salvation,—that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Now of these common usage tells us that one is administered but once, and never repeated during the whole course of our lives, while the other is daily pressed upon us, and even the most lax and careless professors are yet unwilling to forego an occasional attendance at the Table of the Lord. And when we inquire the reason of this, we find that the one belongs to the entrance to the Christian life, and is the beginning and pledge of an effort and struggle just begun; while the other is for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls day by day, as we advance along that pathway to which by Baptism we were admitted. Just, therefore, as we are born but once into life, but need daily food and sustenance to maintain our bodily powers, so it is with the higher life: we begin it but once, but need continual supplies of spiritual food to preserve our souls in health and vigour.

Baptism then is an act of consecration, a rite by which we devote ourselves to God's service, and enter into covenant with Him,—undertaking on our part to believe the articles of the Christian faith, to renounce and struggle against sin, and to keep God's commandments; and God on His part covenants to give us all the blessings promised in the Gospel, conditionally upon our performance of what we on our side have undertaken to do.

Now most of the difficulties and mistakes made respecting Baptism would have been avoided had men always remembered this simple fact,—that it is an initiatory rite. Men have often spoken of this beginning as if it were the end of the Christian life. High as may be the hopes with which a gallant ship leaves her moorings to start upon a long and perilous voyage, yet many a storm has to be encountered and many a danger passed, before, with weather-beaten hull and torn cordage, and many a mark upon her of the rough weather she has encountered upon her course, she enters the wished-for port. And many a ship never enters it at all. The words of Holy Scripture tell us this too plainly of those that set forth upon the Christian voyage, for any to doubt that there is danger to every baptized soul of fatal shipwreck. "There be many called," says our Lord, and "few chosen;" "Many there are that seek to enter heaven, but fail, because an entrance is given to those only who strive;" because even an ordinary amount of pains and exertion is not enough: "For the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force."

Digitized by Google

There were in the Ark eight souls saved by water, and one was the accursed Ham. In Abraham's family two sons, and one only the child of promise: in Isaac's two, and one sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. Six hundred thousand men were baptized in the Red Sea and entered the wilderness of probation: two only passed through Jordan with Joshua into the land of possession. Holy Scripture is only too full of these warnings; for, finally, even among the Apostles there was a son of perdition, and a Demas among the friends of St. Paul. "Be not high-minded, but fear."

And yet with so much to admonish us that Baptism is but the first step and preparation for future conflict, we find even in early times such distorted views of its meaning and efficacy as made men defer it to their dying hour. Constantine the Great was no solitary example of this, but represented the current feeling of his days. Nor is the cause of this exaggeration far to seek. As Baptism was the beginning of the Christian life, it was often described in terms that belonged to the Christian life itself. The early believers, moreover, had mostly been converted from heathenism. To such Christianity was a region of purity and a haven of rest, in strange and blessed contrast with the coarse vices and the hopeless scepticism of an age that had lost all real belief in God, and all regard for even the decencies of morality. At their Baptisms they were admitted to a society so pure and holy, to a hope so high, to a life so noble, that they could not find words strong enough to express the happiness of the change. Baptism was to them the dividing line between a hell from which they had escaped and a heaven begun upon earth; and naturally they spake of it in terms of hyperbole; and then,—by the common mistake which has so vitiated theology, of turning rhetoric into logic, and arguing from the warm and loving rhapsodies of earnest men as if they were the cold, hard facts of the reason,—they soon treated Baptism as if it were the end and crown of the believer's life, and deferred it till their death-beds, that they might enter paradise pure and clean from that Baptismal laver, in which all their sins had been washed away. Really this was to do away with the Christian life altogether. Instead of the Christian race, with men eagerly pressing forward and straining every nerve to reach the goal, and Christ waiting there to receive them and crown each as he arrived with the chaplet of immortality, they were to wait at the starting point, that they might have upon them none of the dust and soils and stains of hard work and earnest endurance.

If we turn to the inspired history of the early Church we find all such mistakes carefully guarded against. When St.

Digitized by Google

Peter preached his first sermon, and three thousand souls were added to the Church, they were all baptized, because they were all beginners. (Acts ii. 41.) So at the end of this chapter the new converts are called, not "those that should be saved," but "men in process of salvation,"—men in whom the work had begun, but who, like Ananias and Sapphira, might end in perdition. So when Paul was converted, forthwith he was baptized. (Ib. ix. 18.) It was the sign that he had begun the Christian course, but he counted not himself as yet to have attained to safety (Phil. iii. 12—14), nor to have escaped all danger of being finally a castaway. (1 Cor. ix. 27.) So when the first Gentile was converted Peter commanded him to be baptized (Ib. x. 48), because the Holy Ghost that had fallen upon Cornelius and his friends was certain proof that God had admitted them to enter the lists for the Christian race, and Baptism was the outward sign that this was so. It was the acceptance of them by the Church, because they had been already accepted by the Church's Master; and on their part it was a solemn consecration of themselves to Christ's service. But the Apostles were not baptized. Several of them had probably received John's Baptism, but that was no admission to the Christian life. (Acts xix. 4.) It was a Baptism of repentance only for the remission of sins (Mark i. 4.), and not a Baptism for a renewed life; and the Baptist himself acknowledged its inferiority. (Mat. iii. 11.) Had the ideas current in the fourth century been true, the Apostles would not have foregone so great a privilege. They did forego it, because to them it would have been a going backward and not forward; for they had advanced beyond the baptismal stage, and reached something better. They had travelled too far along the pathway of life for their Master to take them back to its entrance. Not then as beginners, but as saints fully united to Him, He received them to Holy Communion that they might feed spiritually upon Him. And then after His resurrection He admitted them to the Apostleship, and gave them the Holy Ghost (John xx. 21—23), which fell upon them a second time at Pentecost, with special gifts to enable them to discharge the duties of their office.

These gifts were also often bestowed upon the converts, but are always distinguished from the effects of Baptism. In the case of Cornelius and his friends they preceded Baptism (Acts x. 44—46), and St. Peter's argument was that they who had received the greater gift could not be denied the less. There was a special reason for this precedence, because without it the rulers of the Church would have doubted whether Gentiles might be admitted to their communion on equal terms with the Jews. (Ib. xi. 17, 18.) But ordinarily Baptism went first. "Repent,"

Digitized by Google

says St. Peter, "and be baptized, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Ib. ii. 38.) "When the Samaritans had been baptized by Philip, Peter and John went down to them, and prayed for them, and laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (Ib. viii. 15—17.) So when Paul had baptized twelve men at Ephesus, who had received only John's Baptism, it was not till he had laid his hands on them that the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. (Ib. xix. 6.) We do not read of any special gift attending upon Philip's Baptism of the eunuch (Ib. viii. 39), and yet there was that in Baptism which made him go on his way rejoicing. And so St. Paul tells the Corinthians that it was a rare matter for him to baptize any: his was a higher office as an Apostle,—even to preach the gospel (1 Cor. i. 14—17); and yet he magnifies Baptism when writing to the Romans, and shows wherein its blessedness consists.

What then is this blessedness? What is that aspect of Baptism which the Apostle magnified? His words are those familiar to us because they are repeated in our catechism; but repeated with the warning that the Apostle's words belong not to the outward form, but to the inward and spiritual grace. The real essence of Baptism is "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness. "Are ye ignorant," says the Apostle, "that as many of us as have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death? We have, therefore, been buried together with Him by Baptism into death; that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so should we also walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 3, 4.)

Now it would be impossible to state more strongly the distinctive idea of Baptism than by this metaphor of St. Paul. Never is there a more complete end of the old than at death. We part then with all we have, leave those bound to us by the dearest ties; abandon our homes; cease from our old cares and occupations; resign all that once concerned us, and henceforward have neither rights nor duties. Never, too, is there a more thorough beginning than at birth. In the early Church, where they delighted to express by symbol ideas which had to them all the charm of novelty, it was usual, as our Church too enjoins unless there be special reason to the contrary, totally to immerse the person baptized; that by his being thus plunged beneath the water might be represented not merely his death but also his burial; and by his emerging therefrom, the being born again into a new and different existence.

But St. Paul's words not merely thus gave form to the symbolism of the Church, but also strongly affected its language. Let us cast a glance at the writings of the early Fathers, and we

Digitized by Google

shall see that the idea thus stated by this great Apostle was very soon caught up and developed, till at last, by men not being careful to draw that distinction so wisely stated in our Church Catechism between the outward sign and the inward grace, the mere external form of Baptism became invested with attributes which made men regard it with superstitious awe. It ceased to be the commencement of a chequered course that might end in failure and rejection, and became a goal which implied acceptance without the necessity of running with patient earnestness the Christian race.

If we begin with the Epistle of Barnabas,—which though not written by the Apostle of that name, is yet so old as to be generally attributed to him by the Fathers,—we find all those passages referred to Baptism in which water is spoken of in the Old Testament. Thus when Isaiah says, "His waters are sure" (ch. xxxiii. 16), it is supposed to signify the certainty of Christ's acceptance of the baptized. So in Ps. i. 3, the word *tree* suggests Christ's cross, and the *rivers of water* baptism; and thus Barnabas paraphrases the verse, "Blessed are they, who placing their trust in the cross, have gone down into the water." And so finally quoting Ezek. xxxvii. 12, he says, "This meaneth that we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear (of God) and trust in Jesus in our spirit." (Bar. c. xi.) It is right, however, to add that this, the most precise of all the expressions of Barnabas as implying the forgiveness of sins at Baptism, is not found in the Codex Sinaiticus; which has at last given us a complete text of this epistle, and which is in date by far the earliest manuscript containing it.

In his vision of the shepherd, Hermas sees a tower built upon the waters, which is explained of the Church; and it is thus built "because your life has been and will be saved through water." (Pastor Her. I., iii. 3.)

Justin Martyr identifies Baptism with regeneration; saying in his first Apology, that "those who are persuaded and believe are instructed to pray to God for the remission of past sins; and then after fasting are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated." (Ch. 61.) It is noteworthy in this passage that Justin makes the forgiveness of sins to precede Baptism, and to be the effect of prayer; while Baptism is regeneration, the beginning and entrance into another life. So, too, in his Dialogue with Trypho, he says "that the Baptism which Isaiah predicted is alone able to purify those who have repented, and is the water of life." (Ch. 14.) But on turning back to the previous chapter, we find that this "laver of repentance" is the blood of Christ,—

Digitized by Google

for the passage which he quotes in proof of this purifying virtue of Baptism is Isaiah liii. 5, 6, 11; and that he reproaches the Jews for understanding their Scriptures carnally and not spiritually. Again in ch. 53, comparing Baptism and circumcision, he says that "we have received not carnal but spiritual circumcision through Baptism."

In the opening of Tertullian's Treatise on Baptism, we find a most curious passage. As is well known, our Lord was often called the Fish, because the letters of this word in Greek are the initials of Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour. Tertullian therefore calls Christians little fishes: saying, "But we little fishes, after the example of our Fish, Jesus Christ, are born in water, nor have we safety in any other way than by ever abiding in water." The last clause, if applied to the rite of Baptism, would mean that we are saved by remaining at the gate, and not entering "the narrow path that *leadeth* unto life;" but more probably water here means the Holy Ghost. (See John vii. 38, 39.) As was to be expected in one infected with Montanism, he expounds the words of 1 Cor. vi. 11: "And such were some of you: but ye have received ablution," etc., as implying that there was no forgiveness for sins after Baptism. Sins previously committed were to be put on the "paid side" of the account; but as there was no second ablution, sins subsequent to Baptism could not be forgiven. The fallacy is, of course, evident. "Sin," he argues, "can be forgiven at Baptism; therefore it cannot be forgiven in any other way." The purifying effects of Christ's blood are thus tied down to one ordinance; the merits of His death are limited in such a way as to make Christianity a religion of formalism. No wonder that such teaching caused men in the next century to defer Baptism to their dying hour, that so they might enter heaven not because their holy lives had given proof of their living union with Christ by faith, but because they had taken the first step and given a pledge to live as Christians. But in an earlier and better Treatise,—that on the Resurrection of the Flesh (ch. 48), he says, "It is not the soul which is sanctified by the washing (of Baptism): its sanctification comes from the answer." (See 1 Peter iii. 21.) The passage he was commenting upon is 1 Cor. xv. 29, which he explains of men being baptized vicariously in the name of their dead friends. Now such an act, he argues, could not benefit their souls: for, as St. Peter says, there must be the answer of a good conscience to prove the reality of the recipient's faith, before the soul could be sanctified. He seems therefore to mean that Baptism reaches only to the body, and that the object of this vicarious Baptism was to ensure the resurrection of the bodies of those in whose names men were baptized. Apparently he did not believe in the resurrection of the bodies of the un-baptized.

Digitized by Google

The value of Tertullian consists, however, rather in his antiquity than in the soundness of his opinions. But even if we turn to Irenaeus, we find him ascribing a corporeal effect to Baptism, while the soul is reached only by the Holy Ghost: "It is," he says, "the Holy Ghost who joins us to God. Just as bread cannot be made from dry flour, so we cannot be compacted into union with Christ without the water from heaven (which is the Holy Ghost). And this happens to the body at Baptism; but to the soul through the Spirit. Wherefore both are necessary, —both Baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost, because both contribute to a life with God." (*Iræn adv, Haer.* iii. 17, 2.) According therefore to both these Fathers, the resurrection of the body was the effect of Baptism. And in his treatise on Baptism Tertullian gives the reason why it confers immortality, thus: "Death is abolished through the washing away of sins, because when the guilt is taken away the punishment is taken away likewise." (Ch. 5.) Even Gregory of Nyssa teaches that without the laver of regeneration no one can attain to the resurrection. (Orat. Cat., 100 c.) His more usual teaching however is, that it is the soul which at Baptism receives the seed of a new life, to be in it the pledge of immortality and of the resurrection; but as its union with the body infects it with the stains of sin, so it needs, for the maintenance of its union with Christ, to be nourished by His body and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Now omitting the consideration of opinions relating to the resurrection and other matters not directly connected with the subject, it is plain that these early Fathers paved the way for the errors of future times by drawing no such distinction as that drawn in our Catechism, between what is external and what is real in the sacrament. There is the germ of it in what Tertullian says about "the answer," but usually the symbol was with them identical with that which it signified, and little danger perhaps was there in those days of men being believers in form only. Persecution and obloquy kept the Church pure from lukewarm and nominal believers. Strange views were often held, and manifold were the heresies of those early times; but men were in earnest, and few came to Baptism who were not heartily prepared to obey and suffer for the new faith; but their teaching was inexact and unsettled. Baptism was constantly confounded with that Christian life of which it was the pledge; and men spake as if it was itself the realization of all the gifts and graces that could be attained to by a holy life. Potentially, of course, the beginning does contain the end, but the Fathers often spake as if it did so in act. Far different was St. Paul's feeling: he counted all things behind him as nothing, and looked only onward. No past

Digitized by Google

privilege or blessing was remembered. His whole energies were directed to reaching forth unto those things which were before. (Phil. iii. 13.)

It was St. Augustine who first drew the sharp distinction between the Sacrament as an outward sign and the *res sacramenti*, its real and inward essence. Not indeed that he doubted that the believer received a very real blessing at Baptism, but it was when outward form and spiritual grace were combined. As is well known this Father, to whom we chiefly owe the dogmatic theology of the west, held that there was no salvation out of the Church, and finally limited it to the elect. And so he taught that without Baptism and the Supper of the Lord no one could be saved. (*De Pecc. Remis.* i. 24, sec. 34.) But he carefully distinguished between the outward washing, which is a *Sacrament* only, *i.e.*, a sign or symbol; and calls it *corporaliter adhibita sanctificatio*; and the realization of it in the heart, effected only by the Spirit, and which he describes as a spiritual sanctification. (*De Bapt.* iv. 23, sec. 30.)

Now it is from this Father that the teaching of our Church is chiefly taken, though our Reformers were careful not to press too strongly his peculiar opinions. Thus the word *generally* is added in the answer to the first question upon the sacraments, to guard against the error that salvation was impossible without them. Accept the doctrine of predestination and there would be no difficulty, because all predestined to be saved would also be predestined to be baptized. But at this our Church hesitates. It will not follow St. Augustine so far; but it accepts heartily the distinction between the *sacramentum*,—*i.e.*, the sign,—and the *res sacramenti*,—its reality. And we must remember that in translating St. Augustine, the exact words may not give the exact sense. He calls Baptism "the sacrament of regeneration," and "the sacrament of the remission of sins" (*De Bapt.* i. 11, sec. 16, v. 21, sec. 29); but Latin was his native tongue, and sacramentum in his days in the language of the Church meant a sign, or more exactly a chief sign.

When subsequently our Church speaks of the *res sacramenti* in Baptism as "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace," it is simply quoting the language of St. Paul (Rom. vi. 4); yet with this proviso,—that we must not attribute this grace to the mere outward form. It is only when the person baptized possesses the two essential requisites of repentance and faith, that the sign becomes the pledge also of the thing signified; and the soul is cleansed by that which alone can really cleanse: I mean, the blood of Christ.

Now it is much to be regretted that while our Church is so

Digitized by Google

careful in her language in the Catechism, in which she speaks dogmatically, men nevertheless should attempt on the one side to make the expressions in the Baptismal Service mean more than the Catechism sanctions; and on the other hand should grieve at words used there, because if not thus limited they might seem to go beyond her dogmatic teaching. The services of our Church were intended for a select body of believers living under a careful discipline. Consequently they are often pitched in too high a key for common use. But as a national Church we have thus to use them; yet not by the will of the Church, but by the will of the nation: for the Act of Uniformity is the work of Parliament. Without the rigid clauses of this Act we should not be bound to use in all cases just the same words. And yet if we are always to use the same words, I would rather use words pitched too high, like those in the Baptismal Service and that for the Burial of the Dead, than words pitched too low, like much in the Marriage Service. The two former, at all events, show how precious is the privilege of being in covenant with God, what care there should be to train up the young as members of Christ, and how great is the blessedness of the dead in Christ.

In the office for the Baptism of adults there is, I suppose, little difficulty. No clergyman ought to be so lax as to baptize one who has not given such proofs of his repentance and faith as justify the sincere and earnest belief that Baptism will be the beginning to him of a renewed life. And this is the meaning of the word regeneration. It is a metaphor suggesting that we have now new family ties and relationships,—that God is now our Father, the Church our home, the children of God our brethren. But we must remember that Baptism admits us to God's family on earth, and not into His family in heaven. The baptized are His children, but children in a land far away from their true home (Heb. xi. 14—16); and they have a long and weary journey before them, and many a peril to encounter before the mansions are reached which Christ has gone before to prepare for them, and the portals of their abiding city safely passed. And so our Church teaches. Its most exact words are those which it uses when it receives the person baptized into the fold. And how does it there describe God's family? "We receive," it says, "this person into the congregation of Christ's flock:" that is to say, into his visible Church, "and do sign him with the sign of the cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under His banner, against sin, the world, and the devil; and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end."

Plainly, therefore, it teaches that Baptism is the girding on of

Digitized by Google

the Christian armour for a hard struggle against a threefold enemy. Rightly it assumes that there is a sincere wish to maintain that struggle, nay, even that it has already begun: for it is the business of the visible Church to recognise and seal by external acts that only which already exists; and very properly, therefore, it uses language which implies its belief in the reality of the repentance and faith of the person baptized. The Church would stand self-condemned if it admitted to Christ's sacraments any who were plainly destitute of the necessary requisites. But if on man's part there be the *res sacramenti*, so certainly it will not be wanting on God's part; and whatever gift of grace, therefore, and strengthening of the spiritual life, accompanies the outward form of the sacrament to the worthy receiver, that grace the Church devoutly believes will be in each case vouchsafed, because it would be a mockery to confer the sign where plainly the reality does not exist.

But if any from this imagine that the Church looks upon the baptized as therefore sure of salvation, the very act of signing them with the cross corrects the error; for by it she declares that she enrols them into her ranks for battle,—sure of victory if their faith fail not, sure of defeat if faith be wanting. And she rejoices in every new warrior whom she enlists for Christ's army, and trusts and prays that he will gain the victory; but the very words of her prayer—that they "may *continue* soldiers"—sound the note of alarm. Prayer is needed lest they should not so continue, but become faint-hearted combatants, or even desert from Christ's banner; and, therefore too, it is that she requires sponsors even for adults, and urges these to put the newly baptized in mind of the "solemn vow, promise, and profession" they have made in their presence: a *vow* that has to be kept, a *promise* that has to be fulfilled, a *profession* that has to be maintained. Except that it recognises the baptized as members now of Christ's family, children no longer of wrath, but of God, with a right therefore to all Christian privileges as long as the baptismal vows are unbroken, and the certainty that the Holy Spirit will aid them in every endeavour to follow the example of their Saviour Christ, our Church's Service is one of obligation for the future, even if it be an obligation brightened and irradiated with Christian hope.

In infant Baptism there is this difficulty,—that there can be no personal faith or repentance in the baptized. There is indeed no active obstacle, but passiveness is not enough to entitle any to Christian privileges. But there being ground from the Scriptures and ancient practice for infant Baptism, the question is in what way this personal defect may be remedied. In our Church it is remedied by the "confession of the mouth necessary to salvation"

Digitized by Google

(Rom. x. 10) being made by the sponsors. And thus infant Baptism becomes doubly conditional: all Baptism is conditional, as being a covenant, and as such involving mutual obligations; but in infant Baptism the admission itself to this covenant is also conditional. The public profession of faith, which is an essential condition of Baptism and the sole justification of the Church in granting it, is made by proxy. But in due time that profession must be made in person, and this is done at Confirmation. I do not know that such a profession is any necessary part of Confirmation, but our Service addresses itself to those who were baptized as infants, not to those who received Baptism as adults, and requires them in their own persons to ratify and confirm that promise and vow made then in their name, that so the defect inherent in infant Baptism may be done away. Whoever with faith unfeigned makes this solemn profession, enters fully into all the privileges of the covenant. Whoever through want of faith neglects to make it, his privileges are in abeyance, except so far as that he is still outwardly a member of Christ's flock, and is addressed as one who as far as profession goes is a Christian.

But the rite itself may in no wise be repeated; for by it he passed through the door, and there is nothing but his own want of faith to hinder him from walking along the path. He is enlisted in Christ's army, his armour is ready; all that is needed is that he have the will to put it on. He has had the name of God called over him, and to God he belongs.

I cannot conclude without very briefly referring to that parable of our Lord which seems to have been especially spoken with reference to those who after entering into covenant with God fall into open and notorious sin. "The prodigal son," says St. Chrysostom, "sets before us the representation of those who fall after Baptism." (De Poen. Hom. i. 4.) We see in it a son dwelling in his father's house. He asks his share of the inheritance, and it is granted him; but he departs, "gathering all together:" leaving as it seemed nothing in his home, utterly abandoning all his rights and privileges there, and so wanders into a far country, where he indulges to the very utmost in sin. Yet even in his fall he is not a citizen of that country; and no sooner does he come to himself than his first thought is of "his father." He contrasts his misery with the plenty enjoyed by "the hired servants of his father," and determines to "arise and go to his father," and on his arrival he "will say unto him, Father." In his deepest humiliation,—when the utmost he dared hope was to be as a hired servant,—the dear name of father was perpetually on his lips and in his heart. There is no thought of sin after Baptism being a barrier to acceptance; no thought that one of the

Digitized by Google

citizens of that far country would be received more lovingly than himself: on the contrary he feels himself the nearer to God because he had been baptized. He had been a son: he is a son still, though far from home, in squalid misery, serving as a base swineherd in a country of which Satan is lord and master.

And because he was a son returning home his father goes out to meet him when yet a great way off, and welcomes him with touching tenderness. He gives him the kiss of reconciliation, not on hard conditions but at once, almost unasked, and his baptismal privileges—the robe and ring—are restored to him; the former being the imputation of Christ's merits and righteousness for his justification, while the ring suggests the sealing by the Spirit of God granted him once again for his sanctification. As long as there is such a parable in the Bible, so long those who have sinned after entering the covenant need not despair of acceptance, nor doubt that their Baptism entitles them to pray "Our Father which art in heaven," with the certainty of acceptance as soon as faith and repentance are present in their hearts.

And thus, then, Baptism is the act of consecration, whereby we dedicate ourselves to God's service. It is an initiatory rite, whereby God's blessing is pledged to us when we pledge ourselves to Him: it is an enlisting on His side. For sacramentum also means a military oath,—the act of enrolment in His army, whereby He becomes the Captain of our salvation. It is the admission into God's family, not as slaves but as sons; and thanks be to His mercy, for those who break their vows and desert from their Leader and abandon their Father's house, there is ready acceptance if only they repent. If as sons they return, thinking of their Father's goodness and love, while yet they are a great way off He will go forth to meet them,—will fall on their necks and welcome them back with joy, as sons who were dead and are alive again; who were lost and are found.

R. PAYNE SMITH.

THE LAST JOURNALS OF DAVID LIVINGSTONE.

The Last Journals of David Livingstone. By Horace Waller, F.R.G.S., etc. London: Murray. 1874.

CRITICISM is disarmed in the contemplation of a work like that now before us. We receive it with something of the reverence with which the remains of the high-souled missionary traveller were accompanied to their last resting-place. He being dead, yet speaketh to us in these volumes; and if, way-worn and fever-stricken, his utterance had been confused and uncertain, it would

Digitized by Google

not the less have been respectfully listened to by all capable of appreciating heroism, which never faltered nor swerved in the accomplishment of its noble purpose so long as the frail body could fulfil the behests of the soul. The book would not however need apology, even if any were offered. In its most minute details it is a fascinating record of strange adventure and courageous toil. The matter is grave and important; full of absorbing interest from first to last; and is narrated in a style full of pathos, and yet relieved with flashes of quaint humour, which reveal the large amount of geniality hardly concealed under a rugged exterior. There are too precious indications that in all his weary wanderings the higher vocation of the Missionary was not lost sight of in the ardour of the explorer; while the simple faith and confidence of the Christian in his God are apparent throughout. We do not mean to say that that overflowing enthusiasm and fervent ejaculation will be found which characterize in a very seemly manner the outpourings of soul conspicuous in the journals of many godly men. It should however be borne in mind that all men are not constituted alike; and there is sufficient revealed in the volumes before us to indicate that there was much more behind. In the few pregnant sentences which are interspersed throughout the book, we have ample warrant for believing that the trust of David Livingstone was complete on the Rock of ages. One especial value of the work is the sweeping refutation which it both directly and indirectly affords of the fine-spun theories, which would make out that falsehood and wrong are not after all so evil as the common sense of mankind feels them to be. Sciolists half-informed are ever concocting extenuations of the most deplorable delusions that degrade humanity and keep it in a state of alienation from God. Mainly, we imagine, from the love of paradox, and a feverish anxiety to distinguish themselves by making the worse appear the better reason, the championship is undertaken of some horrible evil; and skill is lavished in attempts at representing it almost as a benefit and a blessing. Sometimes it is slavery; sometimes it is Mohammedanism; sometimes it is Brahminism, or Brahmoism, which finds unexpected advocates even in the midst of professing Christianity. It would be hard to say what sort of oppression or wrong was not the favourite theme of sophistry, to the confusion and bewilderment of the more sober-minded amongst us. It is then most refreshing, in the midst of all these absurdities, to see a noble man going forth, like Livingstone, into the midst of all the misery and wretchedness afflicting down-trodden races, speaking out in plain, rough language the horrible things which he has witnessed, and attesting the truth of his words, as it were, with his life's blood. There is

Digitized by Google

great advantage in knowing, on unimpeachable testimony, that the woes of Africa have not been exaggerated; and that however guilty men who dishonoured the name of Christ may once have been in desolating the western coast of that unhappy land, it is now Mohammedan avarice and Mohammedan cruelty which is the curse of the eastern coast. The nuisance is rendered palpable and unmistakable in the horrible incidents recorded in this latest and most interesting book of travels.

We do not go back upon the previous history of Livingstone, nor do we attempt to recall here his life-long devotion to the land with which his name will henceforth be imperishably associated. Those who know little about some of England's foremost men, know something about him; and to multitudes the events of his life are thoroughly familiar. We therefore turn to the volumes before us, wherein is the account of what befel this mighty man when for the last time he turned from his home and from his family, and girded himself up for toil as marvellous as any undertaken by Knights of the Round Table in search of the Sangreal. If he had gone forth in the fulness of health and strength, the marvel might not have been so great; but it was with a frame shattered by former exploits that he attempted this last and noblest of his adventures. There is a touching incident in the book, where (after recording that Mr. Stanley had urged upon him a return to recruit his strength) he adds:—

"My judgment said, 'All your friends will wish you to make a complete work of the exploration of the sources of the Nile before you retire.' My daughter Agnes says, 'Much as I wish you to come home, I would rather that you finished your work to your own satisfaction than return merely to gratify me.' Rightly and nobly said, my darling Nannie! Vanity whispers loudly, 'She is a chip of the old block!' My blessing on her and all the rest."

In January, 1866, Livingstone arrived in Zanzibar, a Mohammedan town so filthy, that in his quaint way he says it may be called "Stinkibar." "No one can enjoy good health there;" he adds, "it is curious that it should have been selected as the head quarters of a Mission." He left this filthy place in March for the main land. His remarks upon the beneficial influence of travelling are worth quoting:—

"The effect of travel on a man whose heart is in the right place is that the mind is made more self-reliant: it becomes more confident of its own resources,—there is greater presence of mind. The body is soon well-knit; the muscles of the limbs grow as hard as a board, and seem to have no fat; the countenance is bronzed, and there is no dyspepsia. Africa is a most wonderful country for appetite, and it is only when one gloats over marrow bones or elephant's feet that indigestion is possible. No doubt much toil is involved, and fatigue

Digitized by Google

of which travellers in the more temperate climes can form but a faint conception; but the sweat of one's brow is no longer a curse when one works for God: it proves a tonic to the system, and is actually a blessing. No one can truly appreciate the charm of repose unless he has undergone severe exertion."

His course from Pemba, in the Bay of Mikendany, was at first southerly, and then westerly till he reached Lake Nyassa. It was with the prayer that "the Most High may prosper me in his work, —granting me influence in the eyes of the heathen, and helping me to make my intercourse beneficial to them," that he set out. On his road he was much troubled with the misconduct of his followers, and with the ravages of the tsetse on his cattle. As he passed along, he found the people in parts intelligent and respectful. He yearned to know what they had gained by their communings with nature in times past; but he had no one to translate. There did not seem that "boisterous wickedness and disregard of life" which is read of in our dark ages. He asked if the Matambwé believed in God: the reply made was, "We do not know Him;" but all had great reverence for the Deity. One man afterwards said, "He was not good, because he killed so many people." When they prayed, "they offered a little meal and then prayed:" "*Farre pio*," as Horace says. The Doctor notes that trade-rum is almost unknown on the east coast as an article of import, although introduced by the Portuguese. He was often asked for brandy by the Moslems in a sly way. When reminded that their religion forbad it, they would say, "Oh, but we can drink it in secret." On several occasions he met instances of poor creatures (women) shot or stabbed or tied by the neck to trees, and dead. The invariable explanation that he got was that they were murdered by the Arabs when unable to march. These atrocities were the work of Mohammedan ruffians. The people of the country were much startled when Livingstone told them of the numbers he had seen dead on the road. He tried to explain to them that if they sold their fellows they were as guilty as the Arab who performed the murder. "Were it not for the slave-trade," he remarks, "the people are honest, and have a regard for justice." After skirting Lake Nyassa to the southward, the exploration started westwards, passing the base of Cape Maclear, which projects itself into the south of the lake. Six months had been occupied in reaching this fresh point of departure. We quote an important passage relative to what Livingstone calls African sponges:—

"The bogs, or earthen sponges, of this country occupy a most important part in its physical geography, and probably explain the annual inundations of most of the rivers. Wherever a plain sloping towards a narrow opening in hills or higher ground exists, there we

Digitized by Google

have the conditions requisite for the formation of an African sponge. The vegetation, not being of a healthy or peat-forming kind, falls down, rots, and then forms rich black loam. In many cases a mass of this loam, two or three feet thick, rests on a bed of pure river sand, which is revealed by crabs and other aquatic animals bringing it to the surface. At present, in the dry season, the black loam is cracked in all directions, and the cracks are often as much as three inches wide, and very deep. The whole surface has now fallen down, and rests on the sand, but when the rains come, the first supply is nearly all absorbed in the sand. The black loam forms soft slush, and floats on the sand. The narrow opening prevents it from moving off in a land slip, but an oozing spring rises at that spot. All the pools in the lower portion of this spring-course are filled by the first rains, which happen south of the equator when the sun goes vertically over any spot. The second, or greater rains, happen in his course north again, when all the bogs and river-courses being wet, the supply runs off, and forms the inundation: this was certainly the case as observed on the Zambesi and Shiré, and taking the different times for the sun's passage north of the equator, it explains the inundation of the Nile."

It was at this time that the Johanna men deserted through fear of the Mazitu. Livingstone was glad to get rid of them, for they were inveterate thieves. It was through them that the report was spread of his death: a pure invention on their part. As he passed along, Livingstone met again Kimsusu, the chief whom he had met formerly when he discovered Lake Nyassa. Much hospitality was shown him by the chief. From his place the travellers gradually ascended till they reached an altitude of 4,000 feet above the level of the sea. The climate was delicious. The Mangarja people inhabiting these parts were in a primitive state, but very hospitable, and some endeavour was made to tell them of God and of the Bible,—of a future state and of prayer. After a short detour to the south, the direction was north-west, crossing the Loangwa about the middle of December, 1866, and making for the country of the Babisa, who "looked as if they had a lot of bushman blood in them." In January, 1867, we find the Doctor noting that "I loop up my belt three holes to relieve hunger." A few days afterwards, to his great regret, he lost his dog. Food became very scarce as he advanced, "the people living on mushrooms and leaves, with some elephants' meat so high that the gravy was like an aqueous solution of aloes." Still he purchased it when he could. The appetite in this country is always keen, and makes hunger worse to bear, the want of salt probably making the gnawing sensation worse. A few days afterwards the two Waiyau deserted. The story is so important that we tell it at length, for in the end it cost the great explorer his life.

Digitized by Google

"They had been very faithful all the way, and took our part in every case. Knowing the language well, they were extremely useful, and no one thought that they would desert, for they were free men—their masters had been killed by the Mazitu—and this circumstance, and their uniform good conduct, made us trust them more than we should have done any others who had been slaves. But they left us in the forest, and heavy rain came on, which obliterated every vestige of their footsteps. To make the loss the more galling, they took what we could least spare—the medicine box, which they would only throw away as soon as they came to examine their booty. One of these deserters exchanged his load that morning with a boy called Baraka, who had charge of the medicine-box, because he was so careful. This was done, because with the medicine chest were packed five large cloths and all Baraka's clothing and beads, of which he was very careful. The Waiyau also offered to carry this burden a stage to help Baraka, while he gave his own load, in which there was no cloth, in exchange. The forest was so dense and high, there was no chance of getting a glimpse of the fugitives, who took all the dishes, a large box of powder, the flour we had purchased dearly to help us as far as the Chambezé, the tools, two guns, and a cartridge-pouch; but the medicine-chest was the sorest loss of all! I felt as if I had now received the sentence of death, like poor Bishop Mackenzie.

"All the other goods I had divided in case of loss or desertion, but had never dreamed of losing the precious quinine and other remedies; other losses and annoyances I felt as just parts of that undercurrent of vexations which is not wanting in even the smoothest life, and certainly not worthy of being moaned over in the experience of an explorer anxious to benefit a country and people—but this loss I feel most keenly. Everything of this kind happens by the permission of One who watches over us with most tender care; and this may turn out for the best by taking away a source of suspicion among more superstitious, charm-dreading people further north. I meant it as a source of benefit to my party and to the heathen.

"We returned to Lisunga, and got two men off to go back to Chafunga's village, and intercept the deserters if they went there; but it is likely that, having our supply of flour, they will give our route a wide berth and escape altogether. It is difficult to say from the heart, 'Thy will be done;' but I shall try."

A month afterwards we find him recording, "Too ill with rheumatic fever to have service. This is the first attack of it I ever had: and no medicine! but I trust in the Lord, who healeth His people." From the country of the Babisa the course was laid for Lake Tanganyika, through a dense and unhealthy forest, Livingstone suffering from fever and scarcely able to keep up the march, though formerly always first. "Every step I take jars the chest, and I am very weak." After a descent of about 2,000 feet, on April 1st, 1867, they reached the southern extremity of Lake Tanganyika, called Lake Liemba, one of

Digitized by Google

surpassing loveliness. There Livingstone was attacked with a fit of insensibility. After skirting a portion of the lake, he directed his course westward, and then turned towards the north, from whence he went again in a westerly direction to the great Lake Moero, which he describes as of goodly size, flanked by mountains on the east and west. Then he turned south. This country he terms the home of the negro, where the pastures are such as are seen in pictures of the ancient Egyptians, as pointed out by Mr. Winwood Reade. In the latter end of November he reached Casembe's town. The word means a general. Cropped ears, lopped hands, and human skulls adorned his gate: but Livingstone was well received. In a long letter which was to have been sent to Lord Clarendon, over which he was engaged at this place, there is a most interesting account of the district between Lakes Nyassa and Moero, most valuable in a geographical point of view. From Casembe he returned in a northerly direction, and at the close of the year 1867 found himself again at the north end of Lake Moero. His object then was to return to Ujiji, in hopes of getting letters from home. His entry on January 1st, 1868, was: "Almighty Father, forgive the sins of the past year, for Thy Son's sake. Help me to be more profitable during this year. If I am to die this year, prepare me for it."

There has been lately a good deal of idle speculation about Mohammedan Universities and Mohammedan learning in Africa. Without undertaking to say that there may not somewhere be found an institution of somewhat pretentious character, our inquiries lead us to the conclusion that an Irish hedge school, or a pyal school in India, would surpass distinctly these African colleges. The following is the information that Livingstone gathered on this point and on Mohammedan proselytism generally:—

"He declares that no attempt was ever made by Mohammedans to proselytize the Africans: they teach their own children to read the Koran, but them only; it is never translated, and to servants who go to the Mosque it is all dumb show. Some servants imbibe Mohammedan bigotry about eating, but they offer no prayers. Circumcision, to make *halel*, or fit to slaughter the animals for their master, is the utmost advance any have made. As the Arabs in East Africa never feel themselves called on to propagate the doctrines of Islam, among the heathen Africans, the statement of Captain Burton that they would make better missionaries to the Africans than Christians, because they would not insist on the abandonment of polygamy, possesses the same force as if he had said Mohammedans would catch more birds than Christians, because they would put salt on their tails. The indispensable requisite or qualification for any kind of missionary is that he have some wish

Digitized by Google

to proselytize: this the Arabs do not possess in the slightest degree.

"As they never translate the Koran, they neglect the best means of influencing the Africans, who invariably wish to understand what they are about. When we were teaching adults the alphabet, they felt it a hard task. 'Give me medicine, I shall drink it to make me understand it,' was their earnest entreaty. When they have advanced so far as to form clear conceptions of Old Testament and Gospel histories, they tell them to their neighbours; and, on visiting distant tribes, feel proud to show how much they know: in this way the knowledge of Christianity becomes widely diffused. Those whose hatred to its self-denying doctrines has become developed by knowledge, propagate slanders; but still they speak of Christianity, and awaken attention. The plan, therefore, of the Christian missionary in imparting knowledge is immeasurably superior to that of the Moslem in dealing with dumb show. I have, however, been astonished to see that none of the Africans imitate the Arab prayers: considering their great reverence of the Deity, it is a wonder that they do not learn to address prayers to Him except on very extraordinary occasions.

"My remarks referring to the education of Mohammedans do not refer to the Suahelis, for they teach their children to read, and even send them to school. They are the descendants of Arab and African women, and inhabit the coast line. Although they read, they understand very little Arabic beyond the few words which have been incorporated into Suaheli. The establishment of Moslem missions among the heathen is utterly unknown, and this is remarkable, because the Wanyamwesi, for instance, are very friendly with the Arabs,—are great traders, too, like them, and are constantly employed as porters and native traders; being considered very trustworthy. They even acknowledge Seyed Majid's authority. The Arabs speak of all the Africans as "*Gumu*,"—that is, hard or callous to the Mohammedan religion."

After a short journey to the head of the Lake Moero, Livingstone turned back again, for the purpose of exploring Lake Bemba, or more properly Bangweolo, for Bemba is not a lake but a country. This is one of the largest lakes in Central Africa, and was discovered by Livingstone on the 18th of July, 1868. He sailed over it in a canoe. In a curious dream he imagined that he had apartments at Mivart's hotel. On his way back he met with great difficulties, from the state of confusion in which the country was at the time. Most interesting theories are propounded by Livingstone on the sources of the Nile, on the African lakes, and on the climate, for which we must refer our readers to his journal. The close of 1868 found him once more drawing near Lake Tanganyika, but in a state of deplorable weakness. He reached it on the 14th February, 1869, and crossed it in a canoe, reaching the great Arab settlement of Ujiji

Digitized by Google

on March 14th. Here he obtained some supplies, including flannel, which were very welcome. Of these Arab slave-dealers, he says their trade in not a trade, but a system of consecutive murders. He halted here till July, then crossing the lake again he travelled in a north-westerly direction, exploring the Manyuema country, which he describes as surpassingly beautiful. In this country he lingered till July, 1871, traversing it in various directions. The account of the Soko, a species of gorilla, is very curious.

He reached his furthest point in this direction in July, 1870, and then he turned back, suffering severely from ulcers in the feet. A favourite theory of his was that Moses had come into Ethiopia, as legendary tales assert, with Merr, his foster mother, and had founded Meroe in her honour. "I dream," he says, "of discovering some monumental remains of Meroe. If the sacred chronology could thereby be confirmed, I would not grudge the toil and hardship, hunger and pain I have endured: the irritable ulcers would be discipline." How strong this feeling was upon him may be gathered from the following passage:—

"In this journey I have endeavoured to follow with unswerving fidelity the line of duty. My course has been an even one, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, though my route has been tortuous enough. All the hardship, hunger, and toil were met with the full conviction that I was right in persevering to make a complete work of the exploration of the sources of the Nile. Mine has been a calm, hopeful endeavour to do the work that has been given me to do, whether I succeed or whether I fail. The prospect of death in pursuing what I knew to be right did not make me veer to one side or the other. I had a strong presentiment during the first three years that I should never live through the enterprise, but it weakened as I came near to the end of the journey, and an eager desire to discover any evidence of the great Moses having visited these parts bound me, spell-bound me, I may say, for if I could bring to light anything to confirm the Sacred Oracles, I should not grudge one whit all the labour expended. I have to go down the Central Lualaba or Webb's Lake River, then up the Western or Young's Lake River to Katanga head waters, and then retire. I pray that it may be to my native home."

While sojourning in this land, he notices the number of slaves who die of broken-heartedness. In one instance eight slaves died in three days: they ascribed their only pain to heart. The slavers were astonished that they should die, seeing that "they had plenty to eat and no work." The account given is fearful. Further on in the contemplation of these atrocities he writes, "I am heartsore and sick of blood." He found in this country traces of cannibalism. "A stranger in the market had ten

Digitized by Google

human under-jaw bones hung by a string over his shoulder." He professed to have killed and eaten the owners. When Livingstone expressed disgust, he and others laughed. The horrible things he witnessed caused him terrible agony. The place, he remarks, was like Gehenna, without the fire and brimstone. In July, 1871, Livingstone set out on his return for Ujiji. On his way back he had a narrow escape of being murdered, running the gauntlet for five hours waylaid by spearsmen in the jungle. He had been mistaken for a slave dealer, and they thought they were revenging the death of their relations. On his arrival at Ujiji, in October, he found all his goods had been sold at nominal prices. This however was more than compensated by the arrival of Mr. Stanley. We pass over his journey with him to the North-east, to ascertain whether Lake Tanganyika poured its waters into the Albert Nyanza of Baker. Refusing to return home when urged by Mr. Stanley, he proposed to himself:—

"I propose to go from Unyanyembé to Fipa; then round the south end of Tanganyika, Tambeté or Mbeté; then across the Chambezé and round south of Lake Bangweolo, and due west to the ancient fountains; leaving the underground excavations till after visiting Katanga. This route will serve to certify that no other sources of the Nile can come from the south without being seen by me. No one will cut me out after this exploration is accomplished; and may the good Lord of all help me to show myself one of His stout-hearted servants, an honour to my children, and, perhaps, to my country and race."

On his birth-day, 19th March, 1872, there is the following entry in his journal: "My Jesus my King, my life, my all, I again dedicate my whole self to Thee. Accept me; and grant, O gracious Father, that on this year, again, I may finish my task. In Jesus' name I ask it. Amen, so let it be." On the 19th of April he heard from newspapers sent him by Mr. Stanley that the Prince of Wales was reported to be dying. On the 1st May he wrote the memorable words inscribed upon the tablet erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey: "All I can add in my loneliness is, may heaven's rich blessing come down on every one, American, English, French, or Turk, who will help to heal the open sore of the world." It was in a letter trying to enlist American zeal in stopping the east coast slave-trade. When contemplating the wars of Africa he exclaims,—"I don't know how the great loving Father will bring all out right at last; but He knows, and will do it." In this utterance is the difference between faith and infidelity. With regard to the Nile source, he professes to be in perpetual doubt and perplexity. The great Lualaba might turn out to be the Congo and Nile. The fountains flowing north and south seem in favour of the Nile: great

Digitized by Google

westing is in favour of the Congo. He adds in his quaint fashion, "It would be comfortable to be positive like Baker." In April, 1872, he heard of the death of Sir Roderick Murchison, "the best friend he ever had." The report of a Missionary coming up led to a long entry in his journals, from which we extract the following:—

"A couple of Europeans beginning, and carrying on a Mission without a staff of foreign attendants, implies coarse country fare, it is true, but this would be nothing to those who, at home amuse themselves with fastings, vigils, &c. A great deal of power is thus lost in the Church. Fastings and vigils, without a special object in view, are time run to waste. They are made to minister to a sort of self-gratification, instead of being turned to account for the good of others. They are like groaning in sickness. Some people amuse themselves when ill with continuous moaning. The forty days of Lent might be annually spent in visiting adjacent tribes, and bearing unavoidable hunger and thirst with a good grace. Considering the greatness of the object to be attained, men might go without sugar, coffee, tea, &c. I went from September 1866 to December 1868 without either."

Upon a class of persons constantly met with in England, he observes:—

"But no one expects any benevolent efforts from those who cavil and carp at efforts made by governments and peoples to heal the enormous open sore of the world. Some profess that they would rather give 'their mite' for the degraded of our own countrymen than to 'niggers'! Verily it is 'a mite,' and they most often forget, and make a gift of it to themselves. It is almost an axiom that those who do most for the heathen abroad are most liberal for the heathen at home. It is to this class we turn with hope. With others arguments are useless."

Five long and weary months did Livingstone wait at Unyanyembé for the arrival of the men sent up from the coast by Mr. Stanley, among them was Jacob Wainwright.

On the 23rd of August, 1872, he set out for his last eventful journey. The course from Unyanyembé was southward, in the bushy portion skirting the western side of Lake Tanganyika. In the midst of the toils of this march, Livingstone notes, "The spirit of Missions is the spirit of our Master, the very genius of His religion. A diffusive philanthropy is Christianity itself. It requires perpetual propagation to attest its genuineness." After bending somewhat again to the south from the lake, he turned due west, and then again to the south. On the first of January, 1873, he was not very far from Lake Bangweolo. In his approach to the lake he was much baffled by the misconduct of his guides. It is difficult to conceive anything more terrible than the march

Digitized by Google

at this time through sponges, across rivulets and rivers; the sky densely clouded, or continually raining day and night. Livingstone's sufferings were severe. "This trip," he says, "has made my hair all grey." He was now at the south of the lake, but in a most deplorable state of weakness, passing through an expanse of flooded treeless marsh. He could no longer walk or ride, and had to be carried. On the 27th of April he was almost dying. The last words he wrote were, "Knocked up quite, and remain—recover—sent to buy milch goats. We are on the banks of the Molibamo." The details of his last days are most full of thrilling interest, but we must refer our readers to the volume for them, which closes with an account of the transport of his remains to the coast.

Such is the story of David Livingstone. His journals have been admirably edited by Mr. Waller. Much of the deepest interest in this brief review we have passed over without notice, which will absorb the attention of every intelligent reader. Our aim has been from them to present the Christian and the missionary pioneer; for however important his services may have been in geographical discovery and scientific research, it is in the characters which he would have himself prized most, that we delight to view him.

FOUR YEARS' EXPERIENCE OF DISESTABLISHMENT.

PART I.

On the first of January, 1875, the Act which Disestablished and Disendowed the Irish Church had been four years in operation. The period of four years seems sufficiently long to enable observers to judge of the merits and tendencies of disestablishment. We propose offering an impartial examination of the present condition of the Disestablished Church, under the three heads of (1) Legislation, (2) Finance, (3) Social Change.

(1) *Legislative Results of Disestablishment.*

When the Act, 32 and 33 Vic., cap. 42, obtained the assent of the Sovereign, the Irish Church was without any instrument of self-government. For good or for evil, her mouth was closed and her hands tied. She could not utter her voice officially in Synod or Convocation to remedy one of her anomalies. She was governed through an office in Merrion Street, where large salaries were received by barristers, clerks, and servants, for doling out the interest of confiscated Bishoprics and distributing the rents of confiscated lands. To unite two parishes with a joint population of twenty souls, the Irish Church, either by Bishop or Synod,

Digitized by Google

was helpless: she had to apply for an Order in Council. To mend a pane of glass in one of her churches she was in the habit of applying for a shilling to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Duly was the sum of sixpence a year remitted to each of her incumbents from the Central Board, to pay for the postage of letters which he might be moved to write to the Government, begging (with reasons annexed), for a new sweeping brush, dust-pan, bell-rope, or door-key. The Church was not expected to expend a farthing on these ridiculously small expenses. She knows how to do it now.[a]

Anomalies arose under this system of pampering which have been pointed out, *usque ad nauseam*, but no one knew their existence better than the Church herself. What, however, could she do? She had no remedy. Snubbed if she asked for liberty to meet in Convocation; fearful to ask a remedy from Parliament, lest that remedy should take the shape of abolition, she sat still, dissatisfied, conscience stricken, yet helpless, until the Royal Commission of 1868 stirred up the dregs, and the Church Act emptied the vessel and turned it upside down. She was not permitted to try her hand at self-reform.

Some years before the passing of the Church Act, one of the most acute lawyers in the Irish Church had written:—

"The power of altering law is as essential to every human society as the power of making law. To borrow the eloquent words of Judge Blackstone, it is 'one of those inherent (though latent) powers of society, which no climate, no time, no constitution, no contract, can ever destroy or diminish.' The ordinary machinery for altering law may be deranged or destroyed; but the power itself is inherent in every society. No society of men could brook an unchangeable law or endure a ruler who should declare that existing law must be for ever unchangeable.

"The present position of the Church," continues the late Archdeacon Stopford, "in this respect is strangely anomalous. The Church legislates not, but with the consent and confirmation of the Crown. The Church has so legislated, and the Crown has so confirmed. . . . For 150 years our rulers have debarred the Church from altering her law, not by any prohibitory law or constitutional incapacity, but merely by inaction. The Church is in the position of a society

[a] In the year ending 1st August, 1866, the Report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland shows receipts from the estates of suppressed Sees, of £60,573; from suppressed Benefices, £19,935; from taxes on Bishoprics and Benefices, of £15,760; from other sources, of a balance making a total of £177,869. Amongst the items of expenditure occur the following: Requisites for celebration of Divine Service, £7,380; clerks' and sextons' salaries, £24,045; organists and organ blowers, £1,663; fuel, £3,963; postage, £239; stationery and printing, £345. These items of expenditure the Irish Church now finds it comparatively easy to pay out of her own pockets, chiefly by the Sunday offertory.

Digitized by Google

with a stereotyped law; a position which, if enforced, no society on earth could endure. But the State or Statesmen have no design to compel us to observe the laws they refuse to let us revise: *they only suppress the machinery of alteration.—(Handbook of Ecclesiastical Law and Duty*, by the Archdeacon of Meath, pp. 156, 157.)

So long since as the year 1851 the then Archdeacon of Ferns had pleaded in a forcible pamphlet (Olivier, Pall Mall) for a restoration of Synodical powers to the Church. Petitions had been long previously presented to Parliament by the Archbishop of Dublin (Whately): in 1833 from the diocese of Kildare, and in 1843 from the diocese of Dublin. These petitions advocated "the establishment of some deliberative ecclesiastical body, having authority to frame regulations, and to decide in questions of doubt and difficulty." In 1861 a memorial from the Irish Bishops was presented to the Crown, "praying for the Royal sanction to some kind of collective Synod, representing the whole of the United Church." But all these cries for relief failed to persuade Parliament to remove the muzzle.

Convocation was nominally in existence, but the Crown had not summoned it since the year 1711, when Queen Anne permitted it to meet to add five new canons to the 100 canons of 1634. [See note at end.] No Synods, save in name, were ever held, and there seemed to be insuperable difficulties in the way of reviving them. There was a double difficulty preventing synodical action. An eminent ecclesiastical lawyer stated it thus:—

"It was doubtful whether Provincial Synods could assemble without Royal license, but there never was any doubt as to the power of the Bishop to convene Diocesan Synods, although canons made at any Synod, provincial or diocesan, were of no force until they received the Royal sanction. It was also thought that the Convention Act in Ireland (33 Geo. III., cap. 29) was a legal difficulty in the way of convening any Synods, especially any Synods consisting of representatives of the clergy." [b]

It is not too much to say that hundreds of the Irish clergy were hot for reform, had there been any channel of reformation open to them. But as one of the Prelates remarked, in the pardonable irritation of the moment of disestablishment,—"Parliament, in alienating our endowments, resembles the garotter, who, while he relieves us of our purse, claps his hand on our mouth to prevent our voice being heard."

Several of the Irish clergy did not fail to press strongly on the Church the necessity of breaking this silence of 150 years,

[b] Dr. Charles Todd, "The Irish Church Act, 1869, with observations," pp. 38, 39.

Digitized by Google

by demanding of the Bishops the re-assembling of Diocesan Synods for practical work. But so little anxious were the masses for the Church's immemorial mode of self-government, that any irregular public meeting, or conference, was more welcome than a legal Synod. The laity knew nothing, and thought nothing of Diocesan action. Traditional custom had silenced the voice of the laity in the government of the Church, and everything with an ecclesiastical name was called *Puseyite* by nine-tenths of Irish Churchmen. A Church Conference had been tried with success by a northern Bishop, but the success of the experiment did not lead to any general action before the blow fell which startled the whole body into life.

The Church Act received the Royal Assent, July 26th, 1869, and the Church was given eighteen months' grace to organize itself. That Act had removed legal disabilities in the way of synodical action, and had more than hinted that the laity were to be admitted to the counsels of Convocation. "Nothing in any act, law, or custom," says the 19th section, "shall prevent the Bishops, clergy, *and the laity* of the said Church, by such representatives, lay and clerical, and to be elected as they, the said Bishops, clergy, *and laity* shall appoint, from meeting in General Synod or Convention, and in such Synod or Convention framing constitutions and regulations for the general management and good government of the said Church."

This advice from a "paternal Government" was not thrown away. The laity, of course, hailed with pleasure the prospect of having a word to say in future in Church assemblies, and being no longer compelled to be mere listeners to what their ministers might propound. The clergy, or such of them as valued their connection with the past, had been recently persuaded by various counsellors that lay representation was not a novelty in Church Synods. The Pan-Anglican Synod, of Lambeth, had just expressed this view strongly. The High Church party did not object to lay representation for purposes of Church government so long as voting on doctrine was not permitted.[c] The Low Church party were willing to admit the laity with almost

[c] See a clever paper by Rev. W. Maturin, D.D., on "*Church Authority: where it Resides*," published by the Irish Church Society. Masters, London. Price 3d.

Some remarks of the late Archbishop of Dublin, delivered in a charge in the year 1862, seem to be applicable to the question. When counselling the revival, he also advocated the reformation of Convocation, and that in the very direction it has since followed. He pointed with distinct approbation to the action of the American Episcopal Church in admitting the laity to a share of ecclesiastical as distinguished from *spiritual* concerns; by which latter term the Archbishop says he means, "The administration of Sacraments, or conducting of public worship." (Charge of 1862, p. 18.)

Digitized by Google

unrestricted liberty, even in some cases into their pulpits; and in a church where lay preaching was welcomed, lay representation could hardly be frowned upon.

Public opinion, backed by the Church Act, ripened rapidly; and the Primates, declaring that they "had not to construct a constitution for a new Church, but to repair a breach in one of the oldest Churches in Christendom," assembled their provincial Synods: that of Armagh and Tuam in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, on the 10th of September, 1869; and that of Dublin and Cashel in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on the 14th of the same month. To the Provincial Synod of Dublin, the Archbishop of Dublin had invited the members of the Armagh Synod. This invitation had been accepted: the united Synods, or the "Convocation of the Church of Ireland," assembled on that 14th of September in the newly-restored Cathedral of St. Patrick, Dublin. Though held in Dublin, the Archbishop of Armagh, as *Præses natus*, or official President, took the chair in the Upper House; while the Dean of St. Patrick's (Ven. John West, D.D.) was elected Prolocutor of the Lower House.

The deliberations of this Synod lasted till the evening of the 16th of September, and closed harmoniously. It was, of course, a purely clerical assembly; but its principal action was its self-reformation, by spontaneously providing for the admission of the laity to all its future meetings, and by completely remodelling the mode of representing the clergy.

Ex-officio clerical members of the Synod were henceforth to give place, in most cases, to elected representatives. The proposer of lay representation in this Synod was the Archdeacon of Dublin, a dignitary generally esteemed for his personal character and education, but one who has since lost something in popular estimation from his denunciations of the General Synod, apparently because of the presence there of those very laymen to whom his resolution gave the first invitation.[d] (See proceedings of Convocation, sec. lvi., September 16th, 1869. Hodges, Dublin.)

The Lambeth Conference of 1867 had recommended by its

---

[d] Archdeacon Lee now terms the general Synod, "The so-called Synod;" and observes, "The national Synod of the Church of Ireland,—her only legitimate and canonical Synod,—was convened after the lapse of more than a century, and held its last session in St. Patrick's Cathedral in September, 1869. This, our national Synod, may at any time be convoked again by our Metropolitans. Until that time comes, the only spiritual jurisdiction which I recognise is that of my Bishop administering the law of what (previously to January 1st, 1870) was the united Church of England and Ireland."—Letter in *Guardian*, November 26th, 1873. See a note by L. Studdert, LL.D., in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, December, 1873, on the Position of the Archdeacon rejecting the "New Lectionary."

Digitized by Google

Committee of Church Organization, that the "Synod should consist of the Bishop and Clergy of the diocese, with representatives of the Laity." That Report further recommends that the orders should sit together, and vote, if so required, separately; and that the concurrent consent of the three orders should be necessary to the validity of all synodical acts. These proposals have been accurately carried out by the Irish Church (departing in this respect, from the example of the American Church.) It seems now unreasonable that lay representation in the Irish Synod should be so objected to by those who hold the Pan-Anglican assembly in honour.

Meanwhile the laymen themselves had not been asleep. Almost to a man the lay members of the Church had opposed disestablishment, and covered with their names hundreds of yards of petitions. But now that the Act had passed, they were resolved to put their shoulders to the wheel. The most remarkable fruit of disestablishment is, unquestionably, the impulse it has given not merely to the reforming zeal, but to the organizing and legislative activity of the most eminent aristocratic, professional, and mercantile laymen of Ireland. If their theological ardour has run at times in advance of their knowledge, their self-denying toil in the work of reconstruction has been generally conspicuous. Under the terms of the Act, as already pointed out, the laity were called upon to elect representatives and assist in forming regulations. Pursuant to this invitation, at an influential meeting held in Dublin, August 31st, 1869, a resolution was passed requesting the Archbishops to convene a Lay Conference, to be held in Dublin, for considering the best mode of lay representation. The necessary preliminaries having been gone through, the result was the meeting of 417 elected representatives of the whole Church, on the 12th, 13th, and 14th October, 1869. The chair which was on the first day occupied by the Primate, was resigned by him on the second day in favour of the Duke of Abercorn, a prime favourite with Irish Protestants.

The principal results of this Conference were resolutions that the clerical and lay orders should sit together in the General Synod; but with power to vote by orders, if desired, by three (afterwards changed to six: Statutes, cap. i., sec. 52) of either order. And that the number of laymen to clergymen be in the proportion in all Synods of *two to one.*

This latter resolution, which is contrary to the practice of the American, Canadian, and New Zealand Churches, has been accepted as the law of the Irish Church, though it met, as might be expected, with great opposition from many of the clergy. The vote by orders (a majority of each order being necessary to the carrying of any resolution or bill) has however been con-

Digitized by Google

sidered as in most cases counter-balancing the numerical preponderance of the lay element.*

Provision having thus been made for a United Synod, the Diocesan Synods throughout the country were forthwith summoned. The new spectacle was everywhere seen in Ireland of noblemen, country squires, manufacturers, men of business, farmers, and shopkeepers, flocking to their extemporized Synod halls; and every man exhibiting his eloquence, or exercising his newly-obtained franchise, in the service of the Church. A new life seemed to have been breathed into the slumbering Church; constructive, and not merely defensive, zeal was called into play; "no surrender" was out of date. The meeting on a common platform of Bishops, clergy, and laity, was soon found to be of immense advantage to all. Mutual confidence in a majority of cases (unhappily not in all) succeeded to mutual suspicion; and if some few have lost no opportunity of insulting the Bishops, the majority, feeling for their difficult position, have learned to respect them as a bench not to be rivalled in any other Church for wisdom in council, eloquence in debate, and that combination of Conservatism and Liberalism essential to the safety of an old institution passing into a new condition.

These Diocesan Synods, at their first session in 1869, were principally engaged in the work of electing representatives of both orders to the General Convention, which met in the spring of the following year, in the Dublin Metropolitan Hall; where (until the completion of the Synod Hall, munificently provided by H. Roe, Esq., a wealthy brewer of Dublin) the successive sessions of the General Synod will be held.

Nine months of vigorous action had thus resulted in the formation of a truly representative assembly; which, until it crossed the prejudices of some, commanded the confidence of all.

The work of the General Convention of 1870 was the framing a Constitution for the Church of Ireland. The task was no easy one of providing, within a brief space, internal government, in all details, for a Church which had never before governed itself in any way. But the difficulties were not a little diminished by the work of other framers of Church Constitutions, whose labours were before the world for imitation or for warning.

The American, Canadian, New Zealand, and Australian branches of the Anglican Communion, had framed Constitu-

* It is evident that in any division on doctrinal points the number of the laymen on each side of the question must be divided by two, in order that a just comparison of the strength of clerical and lay feeling on the subject may be made. It is unfair to say forty clergy were for and eighty laymen against a resolution, unless it is also clearly recollected that the laity were represented in the proportion of two to one.

Digitized by Google

tions; and it was possible to ascertain the merits and defects of each by observing their working. The Constitution of the American Church formed the subject of an interesting paper, read before the Church Congress in Dublin, October, 1868, by Fleetwood Churchill, Esq., M.D.[f] And the other Church Constitutions named above were published in a convenient form, in 1869, by a Dublin clergyman.[g] About the same time the Church Organization Committee of the Pan-Anglican Conference of 1867 had issued a suggestive report; the Bishop of Lichfield had made some admirable practical suggestions; and the experience he had gained in New Zealand was willingly communicated.

With these guides a Committee prepared a Draft Constitution; which being submitted to the General Convention, and eagerly but patiently discussed and amended, finally passed the united Houses of Bishops and Representatives, and became law in the first half of the year 1870.

As very many English readers may not have access to the document, and as the regulations there laid down seem (so far as four years' experience goes) generally to work well in practice, we shall proceed (as briefly as a correct understanding of the subject will allow) to reproduce the essential points of this new Church Constitution,—contrasting it, where the difference is important, with that of the other foreign Anglican Communities. It is remarkable how smoothly the new wheels run. When it is remembered that almost in all respects the present government of the Irish Church totally differs from the old,—that there is here no "broadening down from precedent to precedent,"—but a new law made by novices in the art of law-giving, and carried out by novices in the art of law-administering,—it cannot be without interest to see how the thing is done. That it commands in most particulars the confidence of Churchmen will be evident, when in a succeeding part of this paper I exhibit before the reader the financial success of the Irish Church even in its less populous dioceses.

The preamble, after setting forth the necessity for self-government after Jan. 1st, 1871, lays down the position of the Church of Ireland as (1) holding to the Canonical Scriptures and the faith of Christ, as professed by the Primitive Church; (2) as maintaining the doctrine, the discipline, and the three-fold ministry of the Church; and (3) as continuing the Reformation protest against Romish innovations. It receives the Thirty-nine

---

[f] Dublin: Hodges, Foster, and Co.

[g] "The Constitution of the Church in the United States of America, in Canada, and in New Zealand. With an Introduction by the Rev. W. Sherlock, B.A., Curate of Bray. Dublin: Hodges, Foster, and Co."

Digitized by Google

Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, adopted by the Dublin Synod of 1662, until lawfully altered; it proclaims full communion with the English sister Church; and lastly, it establishes the General Synod, as having the chief legislative authority in the Church of Ireland, so far as is consistent with due regard to Episcopal government. The first chapter of the Constitution regulates the functions, as well as promulgating the constitution of the GENERAL SYNOD. It is to consist of three orders,—Bishops, clergy, and laity: or, in another shape, of two Houses,—the House of Bishops and the House of Representatives. But both these Houses, or all the orders, are to sit together, and to vote together, unless a vote by orders be demanded by six members of either order. In this the Irish Church has departed from the precedent of the trans-Atlantic Anglican Churches. In both the Canadian and American Churches the Bishops sit apart, as in the English Convocation. The Lower House is presided over by a Prolocutor, and joint action is obtained by messages between the Houses. Many difficulties arising from this arrangement are avoided by the plan adopted by the Irish Church, where all debates are joined in and heard by all the members of each order.

The number of representatives is fixed at 208 clergy and 416 laity. In the American and Canadian Churches the two orders are equal in numbers. These representatives are distributed through the dioceses of Ireland in various proportions: the diocese having the largest representation being Armagh, with twenty-four clerical and sixty lay representatives; and those having the smallest being Tuam and Killaloe, which have each ten clerical and twenty lay. The qualifications of each are: the clergy to be in priests' orders; the laity to be twenty-one years of age, and to make a declaration that they are communicants of the Irish Church. The representatives are elected by voting triennially in the Diocesan Synods. The General Synod is to sit yearly at such times as it shall itself decide; but one-third of either order can by requisition require the Metropolitans to summon a special meeting.[h] The quorum is fixed at three Bishops, forty clergy, and eighty laymen. Every proposed statute or canon shall be introduced as a Bill, read three times and passed, when it shall be law.

[h] In the American Church the *General Convention* sits in every third year from the year 1841, and in such place as shall be determined by itself. The voting by dioceses is adopted in special cases (Article 1, 2, Constitution of American Protestant Episcopal Church, adopted in Philadelphia, 1789). The *Provincial Synod* of Canada meets triennially, and twelve of each order represent each diocese. It will thus be seen that the Irish Church has a larger representation and more frequent meetings than either of the above-named foreign Churches. The Church of New Zealand also meets in General Synod triennially.

Digitized by Google

The rules as to voting are then laid down, and power is given to each order to veto anything by the plan of the vote by orders. The veto of the House of Bishops is reserved, and no measure can pass which is vetoed by two-thirds of the Bishops. The Episcopal veto was only granted after long and bitter discussion. The laity generally were in favour of giving the majority of the Synod power of carrying any Bill, irrespective of the Bishops; but the bench stood firm, and the majority of the clergy upheld its authority, and thus the Church was saved from drifting into the un-Catholic position of maintaining a House of Bishops who had no power of governing the Church. The criticism of an outsider on the debates of that time was cruel but appropriate. "A large portion of the General Convention resembled," he said, "an assembly of Presbyterians, who had stumbled by chance on an order of Bishops and were at their wits' end how to be rid of them." The Bishops have been deprived of all their patronage, and had they also been deprived of all legislative power, the above criticism would not have been far from the truth.

The Episcopal veto was, however, toned down, so as to give the minimum of offence to the conscience of the most anti-Episcopal synodsman. The veto in its final shape was this: a majority of the two other orders could carry any measure if re-affirmed at a second General Synod, unless negatived by not less than two-thirds of *the entire then existing order of Bishops;* the said two-thirds being present, and voting *and giving their reasons in writing.* (Cap. 1, sec. 22.)

The statutes proceed to regulate more minutely the functions of this Synod in making and altering enactments and canons; providing for liturgical revision of a deliberate kind by making the lapse of a year necessary for carrying any alterations, except that of the lectionary, and requiring that all proposed alterations should be sent down to the Diocesan Synods in the interval between the two annual meetings of the Higher Synod. This cautious provision will, let us hope, work well, and give time for making public opinion to take the place of the rashness consequent on the possession of a new legislative power.

The *General Synod* is further given power to regulate patronage (sec. 29), to control the acts of Diocesan Synods (sec. 30), and to alter the limits of dioceses under certain conditions (sec. 31, 32.)

The *Diocesan Synods* are next taken up. In each diocese, or united diocese, there shall be a Synod (sec. 34), consisting of the Bishop, as president, the licensed clergy, and at least one, or at most two delegates from the laity for each clergyman (sec. 35), such lay delegates to be communicants (sec. 38). Minor regulations for representation and voting follow, and provision is made

Digitized by Google

(sec. 60) for the election of *Diocesan Councils* yearly, from and by the members of the Diocesan Synods. These Diocesan Councils (answering to the Standing Committee in the American Church) have proved of great service in the reorganization of dioceses under disestablishment, and, as a committee of the Synod, have carried on all financial transactions with the Representative Church Body, as *that* has done with the Temporalities' Commissioners appointed under the Church Act.

Parochial organization is next provided for. In addition to the old usage of holding Easter Vestries for election of churchwardens, incumbents are required to make out and vestries yearly to revise a list of registered vestrymen; being male adults of the Church who may come in under any of the three qualifications of—first, residence; second, holding of property in the parish; or third, being accustomed members of a particular congregation (sec. 67, 68). A *Select Vestry* is also to be elected in every parish, consisting of the clergy, churchwardens, and a maximum of twelve elected vestrymen. To the Select Vestry is committed the management of all funds not excluded by other trusts from its management, and also the control of parochial officers and buildings. We may remark that the Councils and Select Vestries have already done an astonishing amount of work, and may be said to be in all respects thoroughly successful institutions.

In the second chapter of the statutes the appointment of a *Representative Body* of the Church is provided for. The election of such a committee is suggested in the Act of Parliament, and seems necessary to its execution. All financial business is to be carried on between the Commissioners and the Representative Church Body; for the Commissioners do not come into contact in any way with the Synod. The Representative Body is elected by and subject to the General Synod, and reports to it annually. It consists of the Archbishop and Bishops, and of one cleric and one layman from each diocese, together with twelve co-opted members, principally men of great experience in law and finance (sec. 1).

The sections 4 to 14 define the mode of election of all these members. The 15th section constitutes this body Trustee for the General Synod. The Representative Body was incorporated by Royal Charter, and the document was enrolled in the Record Office of the Irish Court of Chancery, 19th October, 1870. Some have held that this amounts to a species of re-establishment of the partially disendowed Church. The transfer of property between the Crown and the Church and the receiving and managing of the commuted equivalent for clerical annuities in behalf of the Church, was entrusted to this body. Its

Digitized by Google

labours have been enormous, but, on the whole, it has become but slightly popular in the Irish Church,—possibly because it cannot dispense more money than it receives, and cannot treat every case on exceptionally favourable terms. The Representative Body is, in all financial matters, really the governing body of the Irish Church; and it seems to have exhibited some tendency to treat the annuities of the clergy as the property of the Church, to be handled so as to spare as far as possible the pockets of present and future generations of the laity.

The third chapter of the statutes refers to the *election of Bishops and ministers.* The organization for these important purposes, so vital to the peace and orthodoxy of the Church, seems to have some weak points which, in the case of election of ministers, have been already exhibited in not a few cases. The nomination of incumbents to vacant cures is taken out of the hands of Bishops, and in general of private patrons, and placed in the hands of a Diocesan Board of Patronage, which, for every election, consists of three diocesan nominators (one layman and two clergymen) elected by the Diocesan Synod, and of three lay parochial nominators, elected triennially out of the communicant members of the general vestry of each parish. In case of the avoidance of the benefice, these six persons, representing respectively the interests and wishes of the diocese and of the parish, are summoned and presided over by the Bishop, who has an ordinary and a casting vote. [In the American Church each vestry possesses the patronage of the parish. In the New Zealand Church the plan adopted by the Church of Ireland, of combined diocesan and parochial patronage, has, says the Bishop of Lichfield, worked well.]

From the first due care has not been taken in every parish to choose the best men for the important office of parochial nominators. If the religious tone of the parish and vestry has been low, the men elected were too generally those of most standing in society, or those most popular with a party; and under this system of nomination it seems as if the tone of a parish once lowered by an unworthy appointment could hardly be raised again. The Bishops of the Church having lost their patronage, it is to be feared their places will not always be better filled by nominators chosen under many influences other than the highest. All the nominators are obliged to sign a declaration that they are only acting for the glory of God and the good of His Church. The Bishop has in certain cases a veto, subject to appeal, on the election by the Board of Patronage; but he can only exercise it on condition of giving the rejected candidate a written statement of his reasons for refusing to institute him.

Digitized by Google

Incumbents shall not be removable against their will save on the decision of the Competent Tribunal, appointed for trying clerical offences. (Sec. 17, 20.) With regard to the election of Archbishops and Bishops the general principle for filling a See is (sec. 24, 30), (1) The Archbishop convenes the Synod of the vacant diocese. (2) The clerical and lay members present in Synod vote by voting papers for one or more (not exceeding three) persons, being Bishops or Priests of not less than thirty years of age. (3) All those who in this voting shall have obtained at least the votes of a quarter of each order, or of one third of either order, shall be placed on a select list. (4) The members shall then vote for one name each from the select list. (5) This process shall be repeated till some one name has a clear majority of the votes of each order present and voting. (6) If this person have two-thirds of the votes of each order he shall be declared elected; if not, his name shall be submitted again to the Synod, when, if two-thirds of each order vote for him he shall be elected.[1] (7) The name of this person shall then be transmitted to the bench of Bishops, who, if satisfied of his fitness, shall proceed to carry his election into effect. Should two or three names be submitted to the bench, they shall decide on one of them. The election to the See of Armagh, involving, as it does, the primacy of the Church, is more complicated, and is provided for at length (sec. 32, 34). The sections 35 and 38 deal with Cathedrals, Deans, and Archdeacons in a general way, reserving minute legislation for the next Synod.

The fourth chapter establishes *Ecclesiastical Tribunals:* viz., a Diocesan Court and a Court of the General Synod for the trying of Ecclesiastical offences. In the *Diocesan Courts* the Bishop presides, with a barrister of at least ten years standing as his assessor. The tribunal (which in the diocese shall only try questions of fact; reserving questions of doctrine, etc., for the Court of the General Synod) shall consist of three clergymen and three laymen elected by the Synod, who shall hold office for five years, and sit by rotation on the various cases which come before the court, one layman and one clergyman being summoned on each occasion.

Promoters of suits against clergymen cannot bring the defendant before such courts till they have lodged the charge, in writing, with the Diocesan Registrar; and if the charge involves doctrine it must be promoted either by the Bishop or, at least, four male adult communicants. The accuser must also signify

[1] Two elections of Bishops, viz., to the Sees of Cashel and Kilmore, have already taken place, without any hitch under these rules, and a third (Ossory) is imminent.

Digitized by Google

his submission to the authority of the General Synod, must be resident within the diocese, must be personally aggrieved by the Act complained of, and must execute a bond, with two solvent securities, for a sum not exceeding £50, to pay costs and expenses (sec. 7, 8). The Registrar shall send a copy of the charge to the accused within seven days, and lay the reply, if any, before the Bishop (sec. 9). The Registrar shall apply to the Chancellor for a citation, he shall summon the accused and witnesses in the case. The examination shall follow the precedent of secular courts of law. If the accused plead guilty, the Bishop shall pronounce sentence as if the charge were proved; if not, shall proceed to examine witnesses, etc.

The Court of the General Synod, the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in the Church of Ireland, shall (sec. 19) consist of one Archbishop, one Bishop, and three laymen; to be selected for each case by ballot from a list of ten highly qualified Judges of the Irish courts, who have been previously elected by the General Synod. To this court there lies an appeal in all cases from the Diocesan Court (sec. 21). The sentence of the higher Court shall be final. The decision of the majority of the members shall be the sentence of the court; except in cases involving the deposition of a minister from his office, when the concurrence of the two prelates shall be requisite (sec. 26). The remaining statutes of the General Convention are technical, and not of general interest.

An epitome, brief but accurate, has now been presented of the legislation of the General Convention of 1870. It was confessedly preparatory to the General Synod which has met in the spring of each of the subsequent years.

The principal work of the session of 1871 was the framing of canons based upon the old canons of 1634 and 1711, but adding many new constitutions chiefly aimed at the suppression, or rather prevention, of ritualism. The Evangelical party has left its stamp very markedly upon the new canons; and it is hard to see how a clergyman with these canons binding him, and the new diocesan and general courts watching him, can place a cross on his retable, or perform the least gesture symbolical of high Eucharistic doctrine. The more important additions are,—

Canon 4 prescribes the dress of the minister *at all times* of public ministration of the services of the Church as "a plain white surplice, with sleeves and .... bands, and .... the customary scarf of plain black silk;" and no minister shall wear any other ecclesiastical vestment or ornament. Provided that any minister shall be at liberty to wear a plain black gown when preaching. This canon, taken together with the omission of the "ornaments" rubric, will cut the knot of the vestment question in the Irish

Digitized by Google

Church. Canon 5 forbids the minister to pray or consecrate with his back to the congregation, and commands him to stand at the north *end*. Forbids him to make the sign of the cross, except where prescribed by the Rubric, or to make obeisance to the table, or anything thereupon. Canon 34 directs that the Communion Table shall be a moveable one of wood: the covering to be such as the Ordinary shall approve of. Canon 35 forbids lights on the table or at any other part of the church, save where necessary for the purpose of giving light. Canon 36 forbids all crosses on or above the table. Canon 37 forbids the use of wafer bread and the mixed chalice, and of all words, rites, etc., other than those prescribed in the Rubric, with one or two exceptions indicated. Canon 39 forbids processions and processional crosses. Canon 48 establishes the supreme authority of the general Synod, and enacts that anyone contumaciously violating the canons shall be admonished, suspended, or deprived, with or without costs, when convicted.[1] These canons are binding on all clergymen ordained after January 1st, 1871; and if they do not prevent the introduction of excessive ritual into the Irish Church, their framers certainly are not to blame. It is fervently to be hoped they will aid in maintaining peace.

The legislation of the subsequent Synods,—if that concerning education and the maintenance of Cathedrals be left out,—has mainly turned on the subject of Revision. The vast majority of

---

[1] *The Old Irish Canons.* The Irish Canons of 1634 and 1711 were in several respects more strongly pointed against Romish superstition than the English. No. 97, to which there is no corresponding English Canon, is entitled, "*To abolish all monuments of superstition.*" They (the churchwardens and assistants) shall (with the approbation of the Ordinary) see that all rood-lofts in which wooden crosses stood, all shrines and all coverings of shrines, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, be clean taken away. In Irish Canons 9 (= E. C. 45) the words following are added to the English Canon: "And therein (*i.e.*, in his sermon) he (*i.e.*, the beneficed preacher) shall teach no vain opinion, no heresies, *no Popish errors disagreeing from the Articles of Religion* generally received in the Churches of England and Ireland, nor anything whereby the people *may be stirred up to the desire of novelties* or contention." In Canon 12 (to which there is no corresponding English Canon) "the minister is enjoined to teach the people to place their whole trust and confidence in God, and not in creatures, neither in the habit or scapular of any friar, or in hallowed beads, medals, reliques, or such-like trumperies," etc. The Irish Canon 29 (= E. C. 31) throws light on the meaning of the word "minister" in the B. C. P.; for the words "No man shall be made a deacon and *Presbyter* on the same day" (I. C.) answers to "deacon and *minister*" in E. C. In the Irish Canon of 1711, we have evidence that at that date penance and excommunication were actively in use in the Irish Church; moreover the commutation of penance is witnessed to by the Canon which forbids the *whole* to be commuted for money. Canon of 1711 prescribes public penance by those assisting at clandestine weddings. It is remarkable that 150 years should have totally obliterated all trace of this discipline; but *then* it was held a privilege to be allowed to belong to the Church. The history of the passing of the Canons of 1634 is related by Bishop Mant "History Irish Church." Pp. 495, sqq.

Digitized by Google

Irish Churchmen accept the laws of the General Synod *ex-animo*, and it is not too much to hope that those outside will acknowledge that the reconstruction of the frame-work of the Church, so far as it was shaken or overthrown by the Church Act of 1869, has proceeded with a caution and wisdom, and a success possibly not anticipated by those who viewed Irish Churchmen as persons gifted with much eloquence and little discretion.

MILL'S NATURE, THE UTILITY OF RELIGION, AND THEISM.

Nature, the Utility of Religion, and Theism. By John Stuart Mill. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer. 1874.

THE publication of the late Mr. J. S. Mill's "Autobiography," some twelve months before the appearance of these three essays, may be reckoned a fortunate circumstance; as it not only prepared his readers for what they might expect, should any posthumous work of his upon religion hereafter see the light, but also puts into their hands a key to the character of the man himself, without which no mere disquisitions on this most important of all subjects, are of any but the slighest value. In that very remarkable book we had his frank and clear avowal of absolute dissent from current opinions on religion and morals, which these essays amply confirm. We had, too, his equally frank and clear disclosure of the means by which he was consciously and unconsciously led to the utter scepticism with respect to natural and revealed religion which these essays unmistakably exhibit.

The main value of an autobiography does not consist so much in the facts recorded by the writer, however interesting and important, or in the impression he evidently wishes his readers to take away with them of his own life and character, as in the unconscious self-exhibition he makes in the course of the narrative, which like the "ointment in a man's right hand" is sure to bewray itself. The sketches of themselves left us by David Hume and Edward Gibbon are not more valuable helps to our estimate of their characters, as bearing on their opinions, than this autobiography of John Stuart Mill. In addition, moreover, to this sketch of himself, we have in the *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1874, an excellent side-light thrown upon it by one who evidently knew him and his surroundings well, from early manhood, and was otherwise well qualified to pronounce a correct judgment upon his excellencies and defects. We are thus furnished with something more than the mere text of the three essays. Mr. Mill himself and his anonymous friend contribute

Digitized by Google

not a little, by their valuable notes, to the elucidation and illustration of their meaning. The Edinburgh reviewer testifies without reserve to Mr. Mill's mental and moral characteristics; to "his candour, his boldness, his vast intellectual strength, his simplicity, his genuine devotion to great public interests and to the cause of truth;" and yet with the same breath speaks of "his paradoxes, his delusions, and some acts of his life which savoured of grave moral error."

"With a power of analytical reasoning," he adds, "unsurpassed by the wisest philosophers, he combined an infirmity of judgment which not unfrequently led him to mistake Utopian dreams for established truths; so that a course of argument sustained with inimitable subtlety and art, landed him at last in conclusions which the common sense of a child would have rejected. As a guide, no thinker was more unsafe, for he was perpetually exploring devious paths which led him into regions where neither certainty nor truth could be found. What spectacle can be more melancholy than that of a seeker after truth, of vast powers and of unbounded attainments, whose existence was spent in an ineffectual struggle, and who died leaving all that concerns a man to know and to believe, undiscovered and unsolved?"

It is impossible not to assent to the truth of this estimate of the man in the essays before us. Written at different periods of the life of Mr. Mill, they present us with the summing up of his opinions on the subject of religion,—the conclusion of sixty-six years of thought and study. And what is it, but the conclusion from which *nothing* can be concluded. A hesitating, melancholy, hopeless scepticism! When David Hume was dining once in company where Diderot was, he remarked that he did not think there were any atheists in the world. "Count us," said a certain Monsieur.—They were eighteen. "Well," said Monsieur,—"it is pretty fair if you have picked out fifteen at the first cast, *and three others who know not what to think of it.*"[a] The case was common enough then for fifteen to three to anchor themselves on the rock or quagmire of atheism, and proclaim to others that "there is good riding there." In our day there would be fifteen to three who, as Carlyle says, "being of half spirit trim despicably all their days between two opinions," *know not what to think of it;* and at the head of them stands beyond question Mr. J. S. Mill.

"The rational attitude of a thinking mind," he concludes,[b] "towards the supernatural, whether in natural or in revealed religion, is that of scepticism, as distinguished from belief on the one hand and from atheism on the other; including, in the present case, under atheism, the negative as well as the positive form of disbelief in a

[a] T. Carlyle. Miscellanies: Diderot. [b] Essays, p. 242.

Digitized by Google

God: viz., not only the dogmatic denial of His existence, but the denial that there is any evidence on either side, which for most practical purposes amounts to the same thing, as if the existence of a God had been disproved. If we are right in the conclusions to which we have been led by the preceding inquiry, there is evidence, but insufficient for proof, and amounting only to one of the lower degrees of probability."

To the reader who inquires at what period of Mr. Mill's life was he led to this conclusion, and by what steps was he landed thither, his autobiography furnishes the reply.

"I was brought up from the first *without any religious belief*, in the ordinary acceptation of the term. My father impressed upon me from the first, that the manner in which the world came into existence was a subject on which nothing was known: that the question, 'Who made me?' cannot be answered, because we have no experience or authentic information from which to answer it; and that any answer only throws the difficulty a step further back, since the question immediately presents itself, 'Who made God?' He at the same time took care that I should be acquainted with what had been thought by mankind on these impenetrable problems. I have mentioned at how early an age (between seven and eight years) he made me a reader of ecclesiastical history; and he taught me to take the strongest interest in the Reformation, as the great and decisive contest against priestly tyranny, for liberty of thought. I am thus one of the very few examples, in this country, of one *who has not thrown off religious belief, but never had it.* I grew up in a negative state with regard to it: I looked upon the modern exactly as I did upon the ancient religion,—as something which in no way concerned me." [c]

Nor does it appear, from anything to the contrary in his subsequent history, that Mr. Mill's opinions on the subject were ever substantially altered. In his father's system of education "everything was excluded which touched the imagination or the heart," and his whole strength was concentrated on the "drill of the understanding" of his marvellous son. The acquisition of the dead languages, and the perpetual exercise of the argumentative faculties were the indispensable requisites of his early years; and the lessons of the utilitarian philosophy, which excludes and denies the very existence of all that the senses fail to apprehend, were branded upon him from his infancy by his severe and unsympathizing old parent. We find no traces of a mother's tender care and gentle piety: of the little lips taught to utter words of prayer to "our Father in heaven" as the child knelt by her side; of the Book of God, with its sweet and simple lessons, heard or read; of the influences of the sabbath day and of

[c] Autobiography, pp. 38, 43.

Digitized by Google

the house of prayer; or of the slightest care to form habits of kind and generous sympathy with the wants and sorrows of the poor. Indeed, the Edinburgh reviewer assures us that "Mill had, in truth, no experience of the pleasures of practical benevolence; never learned by experience that a single kindly or generous action,—a cup of cold water given to a sick child in the spirit of charity,—was worth all the prating about happiness of all the philosophers."

Is it matter of surprise then, that Mill, who was by nature "receptive," and notwithstanding his powerful intellect, peculiarly subject to the unconscious influence of others, should have received and (a few occasional aberrations excepted) retained the conviction stamped upon him by his father from the first, "that concerning the origin of things nothing whatever can be known;" and that "not only the belief in Revelation must be rejected, but the foundations of what is commonly called natural religion." Sterling, he tells us, with other young men, had looked upon him (from hearsay information) as a "made" or manufactured man, but were speedily undeceived when they came to discuss questions with him of history, poetry, politics, and philosophy. On such subjects his opinions varied considerably, as time went on, from those of his father; but in religion, he continued a manufactured man to his dying day. His own case is the most striking illustration of the truth of his own words:—

"Consider how tremendous is the power of education,—how unspeakable is the effect of bringing people up from infancy in a belief and in habits founded on it. We see daily how powerful a hold these first impressions retain over the feelings even of those who have given up the opinions which they were early taught. The power of education is almost boundless. There is not one natural inclination which it is not strong enough to coerce, and, if needful, to destroy by disuse." [d]

In our estimate of the effect of Mr. Mill's character and training upon his opinions on religion, we must not omit to notice his intense self-consciousness and self-confidence, from early childhood to the close of life. "To the virtue of humility he was," says his too-candid anonymous friend, "as is evident from his book, a total stranger." There is a certain *naïveté* in the way in which he anticipates the inference that self-conceit would necessarily be fostered in him by his father's extraordinary method of education. After telling his readers how anxiously he was guarded from this fatal blight upon early proficiency, and with what complete success, so that his state of mind "was not humility, but neither was it arrogance," he adds:—

[d] Essay on "Utility of Religion," pp. 81, 82.

Digitized by Google

"I did not estimate myself at all. If I thought anything about myself, it was that I was rather backward in my studies, since I always found myself so, in comparison with what my father expected from me! *I assert this with confidence, though it was not the opinion of various persons who saw me in my childhood.* They, as I have since found, thought me *greatly and disagreeably self-conceited;* probably because I was disputatious and did not scruple to give direct contradictions to things which I heard said. I suppose I acquired this bad habit from having been encouraged in an unusual degree to talk on matters beyond my age and with grown persons, while I never had inculcated on me the usual respect for them." [a]

It cannot, we think, be doubted by any ordinary reader that in this estimate of his character, bystanders were more likely to be correct than Mill himself. He speaks in his review of Comte, —of the "self-confidence, not to say self-conceit" of that philosopher, as "gigantic;" nay, "colossal." We fear, that, bating a certain obtrusiveness in exhibiting it, characteristic of Comte, who lived only with his own thoughts,—something of the same kind may as truly be said of Mr. Mill. With the calm serenity of "proud humility," this great "thinker" of the nineteenth century surveys the universe, and looks down complacently upon his fellow-men. Human life, if like his father he did not wholly regard to be a "poor thing at best," he estimated in its present unimproved state at least, cheaply enough. He expresses a lofty scorn of "the uncultivated herd who now compose the labouring masses, and of the immense majority of their employers," while of his own equals in social rank, with but few exceptions, his contempt is unbounded. He was enabled, he tells us, about the year 1841, "to indulge the inclinations natural to thinking persons, when the age of boyish vanity is once passed, of limiting his society to very few persons." His reason being, the insipidity of "general society as now carried on in England," and the great deterioration that "persons of any really high class of intellect" suffer from contact with it. "A person of high intellect," he loftily says, "should never go into unintellectual society unless *he can enter it as an apostle:* yet he is the only person with high objects who can safely enter it at all. Persons even of intellectual aspirations had much better, if they can, make their habitual associates of at least their equals, and *as far as possible*, their superiors in knowledge, intellect and elevation of sentiment." We are told by the Edinburgh reviewer that Mr. Mill "in his later days, affected something of the life of a prophet, surrounded by admiring votaries, who ministered to him largely that incense in which prophets delight." These he would "in perfect good

[a] Autobiography, p. 33.

Digitized by Google

faith, describe as men of the highest eminence, though persons of only secondary merit, who had in truth no better recommendation than that of being his own acolytes." This select mutual-admiration society was not likely to diminish self-consciousness and self-confidence, or to combine humility with the love of truth.

Of course such a state of mind coloured every sentiment Mr. Mill entertained on the subject of religion. Indeed it would be almost ludicrous, if not so very painful, to witness the calm self-consciousness of superiority with which his eye surveys the Universe, and pronounces on its workmanship and its Divine Maker. "To an educated mind," he says in his essay on Nature, "the boundless firmament and any single star of it excites feelings which make all human enterprises and powers appear so insignificant, that to a mind thus occupied it seems insufferable presumption in so puny a creature as man to look critically on things so far above him, or dare to measure himself against the grandeur of the universe." But a "little interrogation of our own consciousness" will suffice, it appears, to correct these natural emotions; and, "though the vast scale of these phenomena may well excite wonder, and *sets at defiance all idea of rivalry*, the feeling it inspires is of a totally different character from admiration of *excellence!*" Nature is chargeable with "the most supercilious disregard both of mercy and of justice," and with "perfect and absolute recklessness," displayed in her "cosmic forces;" with the "*clumsy* provision which she has made for the perpetual renewal of animal life;" with "disorder, anarchy, and 'the Reign of Terror' over-matched in injustice, ruin, and death." "'Absolute perfection cannot possibly be ascribed by anyone who habitually thinks' to the author and ruler of so *clumsily made and capriciously* governed a creation as this planet and the life of its inhabitants." "We are not compelled to suppose the contrivances" of Nature "were always the best possible. If we venture to judge them as we judge the works of human artificers, we *find abundant defects*. The human body, for example, is one of the most striking instances of artful and ingenious contrivance which nature offers, but we may well ask whether so complicated a machine could not have been made to last longer, and not to get so easily and frequently out of order!" In point of fact, we are driven to the conclusion that if Mr. J. S. Mill had been called into the counsels of the Great Architect of the Universe, this eminent "thinker" could have elaborated from the depths of his consciousness a much better regulated world than we have at present! As it is, if there really be a Creator (and but a low probability exists that one there is, in the view of Mr. Mill), we are not to suppose Him a Being of infinite power;

Digitized by Google

and if we can but believe in an unseen Being, good and benevolent, yet not omnipotent, we may "cherish the elevated feeling of *helping God*,—of requiting the good He has given by a voluntary co-operation which He, not being omnipotent, really needs, and by which a somewhat nearer approach may be made to the fulfilment of His purposes!" We may well inquire as we read these words, Can the force of self-conceit go further? We have tarried somewhat long on Mr. Mill's personal characteristics before giving our readers an idea of the contents of his essays, because the estimate to be formed of their value on the question of religion so greatly depends upon what manner of man the writer was. More might easily be added, but enough has been written to show the qualifications he possessed as an expounder of the great mystery of the Universe; a prophet to announce to admiring multitudes what to think and believe concerning Nature and Nature's God.

"The three essays" in this volume "were written," we are told "at considerable intervals of time, without any intention of forming a consecutive series." The first two, entitled "Nature," and "The Utility of Religion," were finished between the years 1850 and 1858,—the exact period of Mr. Mill's married life; during which interval essays on Justice, on Utility, and on Liberty, were composed, which, with expansions and alterations, were published subsequently as two works, the now well-known volume on Liberty and the treatise named "Utilitarianism." It is not improbable from Mr. Mill's statements in the autobiography, that the influence of the lady who subsequently became his wife might be traced in these first two essays. The third essay, on Theism, which takes up more than half of the present work, was composed ten years, at least, after Mrs. Mill's death, and seems to show the latest state of the author's mind. There is a marked difference of tone in it from that of the former productions, possibly, as the Editor suggests, resulting from "his taking a wider view and including a larger number of considerations in the estimate of the subject as a whole, than in dealing with parts of it only;" possibly, too, from the fact that the indirect influence of Christianity and its more tolerant and charitable spirit has contributed to a much softer and less violent temper on the part of unbelievers, in their debates on these great subjects. To this influence Mr. Mill himself in his latter days was more open, as he came into nearer relations with believers in Divine Revelation, of great mental gifts and noble self-devotion to truth and duty. Indeed, what his friend John Austin said not very long before he died, "I think, if I live long enough, I too shall be a Christian," might possibly have been the saying of Mill also, had he fallen into

Digitized by Google

hands other than those which had the shaping of his mind in youth, and enchained his affections and his intellect in subsequent years.

The first essay, Nature, seems to have for its object the refutation of the optimistic Deism, which, admitting an omnipotent as well as perfectly just and benevolent Maker of the world, substitutes for Revelation the worship of the order of Nature, and the supposed course of Providence. Mr. Mill, like his father, always maintained that the argument of Bishop Butler's "Analogy" was conclusive against the Deists, the only opponents for whom it was intended: "The Christian religion is open to no objections, either moral or intellectual, which do not apply, at least equally, to the common theory of Deism; and the morality of the Gospels is far higher and better than that which shows itself in the order of Nature." To dislodge the advocates of Natural Religion from their belief in an omnipotent Author and Controller of Nature, and land them either in Atheism or in the belief of a Being of limited power, working benevolently amidst "natural phenomena, replete with everything which, when committed by human beings, is most worthy of abhorrence," the author distinguishes the two principal meanings of the word Nature:—

"It either denotes the entire system of things, with the aggregate of all their properties, or it denotes things as they would be apart from human intervention. In the first of these senses the doctrine that men ought to follow nature is unmeaning, since man has no power to do anything else than follow nature; all his actions are done through and in obedience to some one or many of Nature's physical or mental laws. In the other sense of the term, the doctrine that man ought to follow nature, or, in other words, ought to take the spontaneous course of things, the model of his voluntary actions is equally irrational and immoral. Irrational, because all human action whatever consists in altering, and all useful action in improving the spontaneous course of nature. Immoral because any one who endeavoured in his actions to imitate the natural course of things would be universally seen and acknowledged to be the wickedest of men." (P. 65.)

To believers in Revelation this controversy has no special interest beyond the fact, that it is one indication of the many now abroad that the metaphysical and religious debates of the present age, are fast bearing us on to a single issue—the alternative between Christianity and Atheism,—and that the foothold of Deists and semi-Deistical theorists is rapidly and surely giving way.

The second essay, on the Utility of Religion, appears to have been suggested by a book which many years before had deeply impressed the mind of Mr. Mill. It was compiled or edited by

Digitized by Google

the late Mr. Grote, on the foundation of some of Bentham's MSS., and published under the pseudonyme of Philip Beauchamp, entitled "Analysis of the influence of Natural Religion on the temporal happiness of mankind." This was an examination not of the truth but of the usefulness of religious belief in the most general sense, taking the sceptical side of the argument. With the aid of much of this treatise, weighted with incidental remarks scattered through the writings of M. Comte, Mr. Mill attempts in his essay to show that belief in a God is not really indispensable to the temporal welfare of mankind; that such usefulness as it may have is not so much intrinsic and universal as local, temporary, and in some sense accidental, and that the benefits which it yields may be obtained otherwise without the very large alloy of evil even in the best form of religious belief. When our readers are informed that the proposed substitute for present beliefs is neither more nor less than M. Comte's grand discovery of the Religion of Humanity, and that his "Grand Etre"—mankind in the abstract,—is seriously set forth as the object of religious veneration, combining all the excellences and none of the defects of our conceptions of the God of Nature and of the Gospel, we are inclined to think they will have had enough of this atheistic diatribe.

The third and last essay on Theism is an elaborate examination of the various evidences for the Being of a God. Into these we do not propose to enter, but will content ourselves with a notice of the writer's conclusions, and some very remarkable admissions that his candour compels him to make.

It is characteristic of Mr. Mill's mental peculiarities that he rejects the arguments from final causes—from the universal consent of mankind—from the universal faculty of intuition, but finds the main strength of Natural Theism in the argument from "Marks of Design." He condescends to allow that "in the present state of our knowledge the adaptations in Nature afford a large balance of probability in favour of creation by intelligence." He at the same time however qualifies the force of such a statement, by denying the evidence for an Omnipotent Creator, or Providential goverment for the good of His creatures, and though he does not altogether reject the possibility of a life after death, he removes it, together with the whole domain of the supernatural, from the region of belief into that of simple hope; and in that he says, "for anything we can see it is likely always to remain!"

We can but say with Carlyle, as we read this meagre and impotent conclusion, "If in those same 'marks of design' as he has called them, the contemplative man find evidence of a designing Maker, be it well with him: meanwhile, surely one

Digitized by Google

would think the still clearer evidence lay nearer home,—in the contemplative man's own head that *seeks* after such!"

But while thus relegating belief in the government of the universe and the destiny of man after death into the region of hope only, and maintaining the sole philosophical attitude of a reasoning mind to be a rational scepticism, Mr. Mill's admissions on the beneficial effect of religious hope, and specially of the influence of a belief in Christ as a Divine Person, a standard of excellence, and a model for imitation, are so remarkable tha they well deserve our attention, while they cause us most unfeignedly to lament that so far as can be known, the writer lived and died without that hope being based on faith, and without any regard to the gracious and beautiful invitation of this Divine Being, the Christ of God, made to all alike, the ignorant and foolish as well as the wise and prudent: "Come unto Me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." With Mr. Mill's own words we will conclude our paper:—

"The beneficial effect of such a hope is far from trifling. It makes life and human nature a far greater thing to the feelings, and gives greater strength as well as greater solemnity to all the sentiments which are awakened in us by our fellow-creatures and by mankind at large. It allays the sense of that irony of nature which is so painfully felt when we see the exertions and sacrifices of a life culminating in the formation of a wise and noble mind, only to disappear from the world when the time has just arrived at which the world seems about to begin reaping the benefit of it. The truth that life is short and art is long, is from of old one of the most discouraging parts of our condition. This hope admits the possibility that the art employed in improving and beautifying the soul itself may avail for good in some other life, even when seemingly useless for this. But the benefit consists less in the presence of any specific hope than in the enlargement of the general scale of the feelings; the loftier aspirations being no longer in the same degree checked and kept down by a sense of the insignificance of human life,—by the disastrous feeling of 'not worth while.' The gain obtained in the increased inducement to cultivate the improvement of character up to the end of life is obvious without being specified.

"There is another and a most important exercise of imagination, which in the past and present has been kept up principally by means of religious belief, and which is infinitely precious to mankind; so much so, that human excellence greatly depends upon the sufficiency of the provision made for it. This consists of the familiarity of the imagination with the conception of a morally perfect Being, and the habit of taking the approbation of such a Being as the *norma* or standard to which to refer, and by which to regulate our own characters and lives.... Religion, since the birth of Christianity, has inculcated the belief that our highest conceptions of combined wisdom and goodness exist in the concrete in a living Being, who has His eyes on us and cares for our good. Through the darkest

Digitized by Google

and most corrupt periods Christianity has raised this torch on high,—has kept this object of veneration and imitation before the eyes of man.

... "Above all, the most valuable part of the effect on the character which Christianity has produced by holding up in a Divine Person a standard of excellence and a model for imitation, is available even to the absolute unbeliever, and can never more be lost to humanity. For it is Christ rather than God whom Christianity has held up to believers as the pattern of perfection for humanity. It is the God incarnate, more than the God of the Jews or of Nature, who being idealized has taken so great and salutary a hold on the modern mind. And whatever else may be taken away from us by rational criticism, Christ is still left; a unique figure, not more unlike all His precursors than all His followers, even those who had the direct benefit of His personal teaching. It is of no use to say that Christ as exhibited in the Gospels is not historical, and that we know not how much of what is admirable has been superadded by the tradition of His followers. The tradition of followers suffices to insert any number of marvels, and may have inserted all the miracles which He is reputed to have wrought. But who among His disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? Certainly not the fishermen of Galilee; as certainly not St. Paul, whose character and idiosyncrasies were of a totally different sort; still less the early Christian writers, in whom nothing is more evident than that the good which was in them was all derived, as they always professed that it was derived, from the higher source..... About the life and sayings of Jesus there is a stamp of personal originality combined with profundity of insight, which if we abandon the idle expectation of finding scientific precision where something very different was aimed at, must place the Prophet of Nazareth, even in the estimation of those who have no belief in His inspiration, in the very first rank of the men of sublime genius of whom our species can boast. When this pre-eminent Genius is combined with the qualities of probably the greatest moral Reformer and Martyr to that mission who ever existed upon earth, religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this Man as the ideal representative and guide of humanity; nor, even now, would it be easy, even for an unbeliever, to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete, than to endeavour so to live that Christ would approve our life. When to this we add that, to the conception of the rational sceptic, it remains a possibility that Christ actually was what He supposed Himself to be.... a Man charged with a special, express, and unique commission from God to lead mankind to truth and virtue; we may well conclude that the influences of religion on the character which will remain after rational criticism has done its utmost against the evidences of religion, are well worth preserving, and that what they lack in direct strength as compared with those of a firmer belief, is more than compensated by the greater truth and rectitude of the morality they sanction."

Digitized by Google

The Greatest of the Prophets. By the Author of "Essays on the Church." London: Seeley, 1875.

THERE are probably few who have not perused with sorrow the mournful records furnished of Australian and Californian gold-diggers, who have wearied themselves in vain with fruitless toil, while searching amid the stones of the earth for the gold ore which is concealed in them. Perhaps some may have had to mourn over the fate of those dear to them who have perished, baffled and broken-hearted, in the midst of the mounds of dirt which they had piled around them. When reading accounts of the ghastly scenes presented in these "diggings," the thought has often occurred to us that they furnished a fair counterpart of the results obtained by the higher criticism when exercised upon the Word of God. Mounds of rubbish, masses of quartz which by severe toil have been raised to the surface, cumbering the ground, a good deal of strife and contention, much ungodliness and irreverent jangling, despair of any successful result, occasionally relieved with the finding of some nugget, which when discovered does repay a good deal of suffering and endurance. Such we conceive are the scenes to be witnessed in the lands where gold is found, and such also may be abundantly met with in what is too often the barren field of Scriptural criticism. More especially of late years there has been a large accumulation of unprofitable matter, which even when crushed with the utmost skill, yields but little return. A good deal of it hardly repays the labour spent in sifting what is valuable from the refuse, and it is wearisome and dispiriting to contemplate it as it rises to the surface; but every now and then there is some valuable discovery made which adds to the wealth of the Church, and strengthens the faith and the assurance of God's people in the truth of His Word.

We are far therefore from undervaluing higher criticism, as it is termed, although we observe that much which claims the title is worthless. Much light has been thrown upon the contents of the Bible by those who have engaged in it, and far more might have been if it had been undertaken with suitable qualifications by those who have employed their talents and ingenuity in it. Just as doubtless more gold might have been gathered if prospectors had always been gifted with science and intelligence, and much labour in vain might have been spared, so with Scriptural criticism. "*Beati mundo cordi quoniam videbunt Deum*," is the language of the Vulgate. If all critics of the Word of God had been pure in heart, more wonderful discoveries would ere this have been made. They would have seen more of God

Digitized by Google

and less of man in the revelation which He has made, and consequently greater marvels. As it is, we must be thankful for the accessions made to our knowledge, from whatever quarter they have proceeded. Even in the works of professed infidels occasionally some testimony may be found, or some fact elucidated which deserves recognition, and needs to be extracted from the rubbish which surrounds it. It is however a sufficiently irksome task to do this, as many who have been engaged upon it have averred.

From the wild and improbable speculations which so often revolt and so often distress, it is pleasant to turn to a volume like that we have now under review, in which there is incorporated much that has been recently brought to light, while that which is spurious and worthless is discarded. It is the production of the author of "Essays on the Church," which some years back were most timely and valuable as an apology for the Church of England. It is pleasant to have from a layman a plain and simple exposition of the grounds upon which he receives the Pentateuch as the work of Moses, amidst all the din and pother of Jehovistic and Elohistic controversialists. As a specimen of the work we subjoin the following passage. After frankly admitting that "in describing the two thousand years which had elapsed between the creation and the call of Abram," and noticing how St. Luke describes himself as a compiler, the author goes on to say,—

"No one can tell us when the art of writing was invented, or whether it ever was invented at all. Job speaks of it as a thing practised in his day; and we are now frequently told of Egyptian records, discovered in our own time, which bear date in the days of Abraham, or even still earlier. Why then should we entertain any doubts that such servants of God as Seth, Enoch, Noah, Shem, and Abraham, left records behind them of the great events of their own day? Or can we question that Moses, who was 'learned in all the learning of the Egyptians,' and who 'supposed that his brethren' were looking for a deliverer, how can we question that he had carefully gathered up all the ancient records of the creation, the flood, and the history of Abraham and his sons, and had been prepared long before the time of the Exodus to write a history of Genesis, or the beginning?

"But how obvious is it that this lawful and reasonable supposition disposes at once of the supposed necessity for finding two or three or half-a-dozen authors for the Book of Genesis. If Moses had gathered together records left by Seth or by Enoch, records left by Noah or by Shem, records left by Abraham or Joseph, how natural would it be that those documents should be not only in different hand-writings, but also in different styles? Where then is the need for imagining a 'Elohist' or a 'Jehovist,' or two or three others of either or of each kind? Adopting the belief which we take to be

Digitized by Google

quite natural, and not at all irreverent, that Moses had gathered together all the records of past times which Joseph and Jacob and Abraham had left behind them, we hear, without any surprise or discomposure, that one chapter of Genesis differs from another; and that 'two hands' are apparently in the narrative, such a criticism' in no way disturbs us. It is nothing more than we might have anticipated: it leaves our belief that Moses is substantially the author or compiler of the Book of Genesis quite unshaken."

A very interesting portion of the book is that in which the peculiar preparation which Moses had for his great work is sketched out. In the course of this pains are taken to show with what scrupulous propriety Stephen asserted of Moses that he was not only "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," but was also "mighty in words and deeds." "He was then," it is said, "fully prepared, according to the ideas of men in general, to take the part of a Pericles or a Coriolanus,—to equal, or to surpass, the deeds of a Cyrus, a Scipio, or a Cæsar." A very forcible contrast is then drawn between Moses when he was forty years of age and Moses when he was eighty; between the furious and impetuous smiter of the Egyptian, and of the Midianite shepherds, and him who was very meek above all men that were on the face of the earth. It is well shown how he was changed in words also as in deeds, and how the "careless and seemingly profitless occupation of keeping sheep in Midian was in fact a needful part of his education." We cannot follow the course of the narrative closely, but may call attention to some valuable remarks upon the going up of Moses unto God in Sinai, and in the chapter entitled "The Gospel preached from Sinai," which approve themselves to us as true and Scriptural, however offensive they may seem to those who are unable to receive the means of salvation provided by God for penitents, or who disbelieve the doom which He has decreed for those who reject His counsel, against themselves.

In the description of the long sojourn which the rebellious generation, who had come out of Egypt, were compelled to make until they were consumed, many most striking remarks will be found. The change in that which succeeded is ascribed by the author to the teaching of Moses, who educated under his own eye and out of the reach of the idolatry of Egypt the children of these obstinate and stiff-necked men, and fitted them to be the conquerors of the Land of Promise. It is not noticed by the author; but in connection with this inability—even under the guidance of Moses for those who had been trained in idolatry—to rid themselves of the contamination in which they had been nurtured, may we not discover some explanation of the slow progress of mission work among those who are from earliest

Digitized by Google

childhood mad upon idols, or of Protestant effort among Popish nations. Ever and anon, in the providence of God, mighty men are raised up, like Moses or like Luther; but we have but to turn to the Word of God, or to the History of the Reformation to see how difficult a task it is to raise up a spiritual people out of the slaves of sorcery and superstition. Again, the value of training in the statutes and the judgments of God, and the importance of impressing them upon the young and tender mind is most strikingly put forth when we attentively meditate upon what the author terms the silence of Scripture as to what took place during eight-and-thirty years,—silence which we think he has rightly interpreted. The work of the teacher, especially of the spiritual teacher is slow, but it is fruitful.

The volume we have been reviewing is of an unpretending character. It makes no special claims to profound learning, although much is apparent. We can commend it for the information it contains; but we commend it rather as a striking book, full of shrewd sense, clear statement, and intelligent interpretation of the sacred records. It will be found edifying and instructive, exhibiting, as it does throughout, faith and reverence: valuable qualities in any one who undertakes to handle the Word of God.

KALISCH'S HISTORY AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A History and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament. With a New Translation by M. M. Kalisch, Phil. Doc., M.A. Leviticus in two Parts. 1867-72.

English or Abridged Edition. Two vols., 8vo. London: Longmans. 1872.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Leviticus. With a new Translation by James G. Murphy, LL.D., S.C.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. Author of Commentaries on Genesis and Exodus. London: Trübner and Company. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke. Dublin: John Robertson and Co. 1872.

TWELVE years had elapsed since Dr. Kalisch put forth the first volume of his Old Testament Commentary at the time when the first of the two volumes now under review made its appearance. In his Commentary on the book of Exodus, a book which Dr. Kalisch selected as the subject of his first volume, as forming in his judgment "the centre of Divine revelation, and as best

Digitized by Google

calculated to convey a correct idea of the spirit and tendency of his Commentary," our author endeavoured, according to the explanation of his design contained in the preface to that volume, to avoid two extremes. On the one hand he complains that the English Commentaries most current among us "spiritualize, but do not expound;" and he observes that "a preaching, spiritualizing Commentary does not deserve the appellation of Commentary at all." On the other hand he considers that "modern criticism also has its defects;" that by it "the sacred records are dismembered, transposed, falsified; the most aerial conjectures framed; and the palm is awarded to those who excel the rest in bold and fanciful theories." The professed object of his own work was to avoid both of "these extremes," and to "produce an equilibrium between the faith of former ages and the science of our century."

As regards the English text adopted as the basis of his Commentary, Dr. Kalisch, whilst fully acknowledging the merits of the English authorized version, expresses his conviction as the result of the progress which has been made in Hebrew philology since A.D. 1611, that there is great need of a thorough revision; and consequently he deems it essential to add to his Commentary a new translation, embodying the results of his own investigation. The plan uniformly adopted by Dr. Kalisch is to put forth one edition of his Commentary adapted to meet the requirements of the Hebrew scholar and the philologist, and another adapted to the wants of the ordinary English reader; in addition to the revised version which is contained in both editions of this Commentary, together with some dissertations on particular subjects. The larger edition of the work which is now under review contains the Hebrew text, a grammatical analysis of difficult passages, and other philological remarks.

In dealing with the character and contents of the Books of the Old Testament Dr. Kalisch, in the volume of his Commentary which was first published, viz., that on Exodus, recognises fully and unequivocally their supernatural character, as containing the records of a "Divine revelation" both to Israel and to mankind. In this revelation the existence both of the miraculous and also of the prophetical elements is distinctly admitted, and the composition of the book as that of a single contemporary writer; "a perfect whole, pervaded throughout by one spirit and the same leading ideas," is vigorously maintained.

In the introduction to the second volume of the Commentary, that on the book of Genesis, which was published in 1858, Dr. Kalisch examines at considerable length the relation between the Scriptures and the natural sciences, more especially those of geology and astronomy; and he arrives, as the result of this

Digitized by Google

inquiry, at the conclusion that, with regard to astronomy and geology, the Biblical records are, in many essential points, utterly and irreconcilably at variance with the established results of modern researches. Notwithstanding, however, the numerous indications which are found in this volume of a change in the views of the writer on many points of the highest importance, we still meet with apparent admissions of the existence of the supernatural elements in the Old Testament scriptures,—of the miraculous element, *e.g.*, as involved in the destruction of the cities of the plain; and, again, of the prophetical element as involved in the blessing of dying Jacob.

At the expiration of nine years from the publication of the Commentary on Genesis, the first of the volumes now under review, was put forth, and in the year 1872 the Commentary on Leviticus was completed. In the preface to these volumes Dr. Kalisch describes the change which has been wrought in the intellectual history of England during the last decennium as one which may be described as "an intellectual revolution." In support of this assertion he alludes to the results of the labours of Buckle in the department of general history; to the works of Darwin, Huxley and Lyell in the department of natural sciences; to the commotion produced by "Essays and Reviews" in the sphere of theology, and once more to the effect of the writings of Rénan, Strauss and Colenso, in the unsettling of long established views, and the uprooting of "long cherished opinions or prejudices."

This general fermentation of minds appeared to our author peculiarly propitious for the reception of his own more advanced, and, as we must presume, more mature Biblical conclusions. These it is which we find embodied in the volumes before us; in regard to which Dr. Kalisch indulges the belief that he has "in some slight degree succeeded in assigning to the Biblical documents their proper place in the future phases and struggles of our civilization."

We deeply regret to find, as the result of our examination of these volumes, that the conclusions at which Dr. Kalisch has arrived are absolutely subversive of the fundamental principles of belief in a Divine revelation. Miracles, prophecy, inspiration, —nay more, the very existence of the Holy Spirit as "distinct from the intellect of man" are unreservedly rejected; and the Bible is reduced to the level of ordinary human compositions, of a remote and unenlightened antiquity,—or a reservoir of idle legends, and a repertory of antiquated and long exploded notions.

Were it not for the ample stores of learning, and the results of considerable research which these volumes contain, we should

Digitized by Google

probably at once have consigned them to that oblivion which is more or less gradually becoming the fate of similar works, as others of a more advanced character take their place. In any case we should not have deemed them worthy of any protracted notice in the pages of a Periodical which has uniformly been distinguished for its uncompromising advocacy of the claims of the Bible as a direct revelation to man of the mind and of the purposes of God.

The general grounds on which Dr. Kalisch discards, as altogether untenable, that supernatural element which, in our judgment, constitutes the main distinction between the Bible and all other books, are as follows :—

In regard to miracles, he considers that the idea of miracles rests virtually on the assumption that "nature pays special regard to the deeds and destinies of individuals or single nations, and bestows aid and sympathy, or displays resistance and enmity, according to the pleasure of a ruling power." In opposition to this idea, he maintains that the whole economy of nature is "one and indivisible, embracing the universe, and working in majestic impartiality for all worlds alike;" in confirmation of which view he appeals to the authority of Spinoza, who regards *miracles* and *ignorance* as "convertible terms."

We are doubtful whether any course of abstract reasoning will avail in the case of persons who first assume what the laws of nature are, or ought to be, and who then argue that the existence of miracles is incompatible with the definitions which they have arbitrarily laid down. It is almost needless to say that the man who believes most firmly in the truths of Revelation is the man who maintains most strenuously the unity and the universality of the Divine administration. The point of diversity between ourselves and our adversaries on this subject appears to us to be this: that whereas they urge that a Divine Providence cannot be both universal and also individual, we, on the contrary, maintain that the combination of the two is the crowning demonstration of the wisdom and power of the supreme Ruler of the universe. Let but the existence of a Being possessed of infinite wisdom and power be admitted, and our contention is that the apparent deviations from the uniformity of the laws which He has imposed upon His creation are in reality so many exhibitions of the perfection of the attributes of the Creator. If the deviations from the prevailing laws of Babbage's calculating machine afford evidence of the skill of the contriver, in like manner we contend that the supernatural prolongation of light at the battle of Bethhoron, however accomplished, affords proof of the surpassing wisdom and power of Him by whom that apparent deviation from the laws of nature had been pro-

Digitized by Google

vided for, in the day when He "appointed the moon for seasons," and when He determined the time of the "going down of the sun."

But whilst firmly persuaded that the minuteness of the Providential administration of the universe is not only compatible with the highest perfection of order and harmony, but enhances in an immeasurable degree our estimate of the wisdom and the power of the divine Creator and Administrator, we prefer, when dealing with those who deny the direct interference of God in the affairs of nations or of individuals, to take our stand upon those laws of evidence which are applicable to all other transactions; and to defend our belief in miracles on the simple issue that the facts of history admit of no other explanation.

It is easy indeed for writers such as Dr. Kalisch to confound the *prodigia* and the *portenta* of ancient Rome with the well-attested facts of Jewish and of Gospel history; but it is difficult to understand how one who is accustomed to weigh the ordinary rules of evidence can seriously allege that both rest upon the same basis, and consequently must stand or fall together. We would appeal, for instance, to the plagues of Egypt, to the passage of the Red Sea, and to the giving of the law from Mount Sinai, with all its attendant circumstances. We have to deal here not with mere isolated facts, but with a series of historical circumstances, sustaining the closest and most inseparable connection one with the other. It is easy, indeed, in the case of the passage of the Red Sea,—to select one instance,—to suggest the theory that Moses skilfully took advantage of a ford at ebb-tide, or even to appeal (in accordance with the testimony of the sacred history itself) to the "strong east wind" which was employed in effecting the retreat of the waters; but we still affirm, and that without fear of refutation, that the operation of natural causes, *in the manner and at the time recorded in the Book of Exodus*, does but exhibit in a higher degree the supernatural character of the whole transaction. This combination of natural and supernatural causes may indeed, and does show, that this conversion of the waters into dry land was the work of that same God who in the beginning "gathered together the waters into one place," and caused "the dry land to appear;" but it detracts not one jot or tittle from the miraculous character of the whole transaction, that the natural and the supernatural were so interwoven throughout the whole of it, that it is absolutely impossible for man to determine the precise limits of those agencies which have no other distinction, either in their origin or in their manifestation, than that which is the result of his own imperfect comprehension of the nature and operation of both.

It is an easy thing to assert the impossibility of miracles on

Digitized by Google

the ground of their inconsistency with "the established laws of the universe," when the very question at issue is what those established laws are. It is simply irrational to affirm their incredibility on the ground that they are palpable inventions of unhistoric ages, so long as we can point to permanent results which could have been brought about by the intervention of no other agency.

We refrain from a rehearsal of the trite objections alleged by Dr. Kalisch to the efficacy of prayer, not only on account of the necessary limits within which the present review must be confined, but also because they have been often (and more especially within the last few years) so successfully encountered and overthrown, that it would be a needless slaying of the slain were we to bring them again to life with a view to their renewed demolition. For the same reason we pass over Dr. Kalisch's observations on the subject of revelation and of inspiration, and we proceed to notice some of his remarks on prophecy, on the ground that this is one of those subjects on which the truth or fallacy of our author's views may be more briefly and (as we think) more conclusively determined.

Dr. Kalisch's views on prophecy, as denoting the prediction of future events, are enunciated in the following terms: "The belief in prophecy has the same origin as the doctrines of revelation and inspiration; namely, the impossible supposition that the Deity enters into a direct and personal intercourse with some men specially chosen." (I. 457.) Unfortunately for the cause of which Dr. Kalisch here avows himself the champion, he has not been content to take shelter behind those convenient generalities which often admit of no other refutation than an equally general contradiction; but he has ventured to specify several instances in which the prophecies of the Old Testament have either distinctly and unequivocally failed of their accomplishment, or have received their fulfilment "in a different manner and form" (to adopt the phraseology of Dr. Kalisch) from that in which they were foretold.

We will briefly examine a few of the instances adduced by our author; and lest we should be thought to have made an arbitrary selection, we will take them in the order in which they stand. The first instance alleged by Dr. Kalisch is enunciated in the following words: "Thus Amos foretold 'Jeroboam shall die by the sword, and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of their own land;' whereas the historical account relates 'that he slept with his fathers, and Nadab, his son, reigned in his stead.'" (I. p. 455.) Now if, as we presume, Dr. Kalisch infers, from the second passage which he has quoted, that Jeroboam did not die a violent death, we will only observe here (for we shall

Digitized by Google

have occasion to revert to this point) that he has altogether mistaken the Biblical use of the phrase "he slept with his fathers;" and that the utmost which he can allege in regard to the death of Jeroboam is that its mode is not recorded. But let the utmost be conceded which it is possible even for Dr. Kalisch to infer from these words,—viz., that Jeroboam's death was a natural, not a violent death,—and we still affirm that no proof whatever exists that the prophecy of Amos was not fulfilled. For what, we ask, was the prophecy which Amos actually delivered? It is true, indeed, that we read in Amos vii. 11 (the passage to which Dr. Kalisch refers), "For thus Amos saith, Jeroboam shall die by the sword." [a] But whose, we ask, are these words? Not, as is evident, the words of Amos himself; but those of Amaziah, the false prophet of Bethel: whereas the prophecy of Amos, or rather of the Lord Himself, as uttered by the lips of the prophet, are contained in a preceding verse, as follows: "And the high places of Isaac shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste; and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword."

The literal fulfilment of the words thus recorded, as having been actually spoken by Amos, admits of no denial. In the very next generation the power of Jeroboam was utterly extinguished in the person of his son Zachariah; in the fourth generation, from Jehu, as it had been foretold to that King; and by the sword of Shallum, as it had been foretold by the prophet Amos. (2 Kings xv. 10, 12.)

We have met with so many cases in which the impugners of the truth of Scripture have succeeded in establishing nothing more than the recklessness of their own assertions, that our surprise is but slightly excited by any additional instances which come before our notice. At the same time we were scarcely prepared for so remarkable a blunder as that which has been committed in the present instance by Dr. Kalisch, when he adduces the account of the death of Jeroboam I., the son of Nebat, and the succession of his son Nadab to his throne, in support of his assertion that the prophecy of Amos had failed respecting the death of Jeroboam II., the son of Joash, and the captivity of the house of Israel. This singular blunder is the more inexcusable, inasmuch as in the very commencement of his prophecy Amos has himself fixed the date of his predic-

[a] In his article on Amos, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," Dean Stanley asserts as an undoubted fact that the words in question were spoken by Amos. In the second volume, however, of his Lectures on the Jewish Church, he qualifies his statement in the following terms: "Whether the words in vii. 10 are represented as having been spoken by Amos, or only put into his mouth by Amaziah, is uncertain." (P. 361 note.)

Digitized by Google

tions in the following very explicit terms: "The words of Amos .... which he said concerning Israel in the days of Uzziel, King of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, King of Israel, two years before the earthquake."

The second instance of unfulfilled prophecy alleged by Dr. Kalisch is enunciated thus: "Jeremiah prophecied of King Jehoiakim 'that he shall be buried in (? with) the burial of an ass, and drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem;' but history tells us that 'he slept with his fathers.'" [b] Had Dr. Kalisch taken the trouble to examine the sense in which the frequently-recurring phrase, "he slept with his fathers," is employed by the sacred writers, he would not have been betrayed into the really inexcusable error of supposing that it denotes a peaceful death. It will suffice, in proof of this assertion, to refer to the case of King Ahab; concerning whom it is expressly declared—not by different writers, but by one and the same—that he died of a wound which he received in battle, and that "the dogs licked up his blood," and that he "slept with his fathers." (1 Kings xxii. 37, 38, 40.) Inasmuch however as our modern critics have no scruple, when it suits their purpose, to assign the respective portions, even of a closely connected narrative, to different writers, and to allege the existence of manifest inconsistencies in the portions thus arbitrarily rent asunder, as affording indications of a diversity of authorship, we will add, in proof that the interpretation of the words in question was not devised in order to meet a difficulty, the following extract from an author to whom no such design will be imputed by those who are acquainted with his writings. In a foot note to page 262 of the fourth volume of the "History of Israel," Ewald writes thus in reference to the death of Jehoiakim:—

"The particulars of Jehoiakim's death are very obscure. The standing phrase 'He slept with his fathers' (2 Kings xxiv. 5) simply indicates his death. That he was taken prisoner is stated in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6. We may however gather the circumstances, with some degree of probability, from the words chosen by Jeremiah, xxii. 18, sq.; xxxvi. 30, since while the prophet had certainly predicted long beforehand the King's miserable end, these words in their present form were not written down till after the event."

This remarkable testimony, proceeding from such a source, will at least suffice to show that in the judgment of one who has been pronounced by Dean Stanley (we simply quote, without endorsing, the correctness of the testimony) "the first Biblical scholar in Europe," there is no ground for disputing the literal truth of the words of Jeremiah,—whether those words were

[b] Ib.

Digitized by Google

uttered, as we believe, in common with Dr. Kalisch, as a distinct prediction of the future, or whether they were spoken, as Ewald seems to think, as an historical record of the past. We submit, then, that the utmost which can with truth be alleged in the present instance is, that whereas the prophet Jeremiah predicted, in the most precise terms, the miserable end of King Jehoiakim, the Books of Kings and of Chronicles have failed to record the fulfilment of the prediction. We learn from the latter (2 Chron. xxxvi. 6) that King Nebuchadnezzar came up against Jehoiakim, and bound him in fetters "to carry him to Babylon." We infer however from the facts that Jehoiakim became his servant for "three years," and that after that he turned and rebelled against the King of Babylon (2 Kings xxiv. 1), and that his reign was of eleven years' duration, that for some reason, which is not recorded, the intention of Nebuchadnezzar to carry Jehoiakim into Babylon was not carried into execution. We find indeed in an earlier part of the prophecies of Jeremiah (viii. 1, 2) a prediction, which was doubtless accomplished *after the capture of the city*, that indignities similar to those specified in the case of Jehoiakim should be perpetrated by the conquerors upon the bodies of the Kings of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem generally, so that they should "not be gathered, nor be buried;" but should be "for dung upon the face of the earth." In the case of Jehoiakim, however, there is every ground for believing that the circumstances *immediately attendant upon his death* corresponded literally with the prediction of Jeremiah; and that (as it is expressly related by Josephus) the bodies of the King "with several of the stoutest and finest men in Hierosolyma" were ordered to be "thrown without the walls, without the rite of interment."[c] In any case, as we have already observed, Dr. Kalisch's objection to the literal fulfilment of the prediction concerning the death of Jehoiakim is founded upon a total misconception of the meaning of a common phrase, and is devoid even of that semblance of truth which similar objections often possess in the absence of direct historical evidence respecting the events in question.[d] We will add only to what we have already

[c] "Antiquities of the Jews," book x., chap. 6.

[d] There would have been more semblance of truth in the objection had Dr. Kalisch appealed to the prediction contained in Jer. xxxvi. 30, concerning Jehoiakim's posterity,—"He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David;" inasmuch as Jehoiachin, his son, actually succeeded his father. The inconsistency however here, as elsewhere, is but apparent; inasmuch as the true meaning of the prediction obviously is, that there should be none of the successors of Jehoiakim firmly established and continuing upon the throne. When thus understood, the accomplishment of the prophecy cannot be disputed; inasmuch as Jehoiachin, after a reign of three months, was compelled to surrender, and was carried captive into Babylon; and in the person of Zedekiah,

Digitized by Google

advanced on this point the excellent remark of Graf, who appeals, as Ewald does, to the repetition of the prediction in chap. xxxvi.; and asks whether, while the predictions contained in xxii. 12, 25, sq., tally so completely with the history, that contained in xxii. 18, sq., is to be held as contradicting it?

Once more, Dr. Kalisch appeals to the judgments denounced against Edom by the mouths of the prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Obadiah, as not having received their accomplishment in the actual history of that nation. Now it is impossible to deny that the Edomites were sorely chastened by the Chaldeans, the Maccabeans, and the Romans; insomuch, indeed, that from the days of Titus they may be said to have disappeared from the page of history as a distinct people. But Dr. Kalisch appears to be ignorant of the fact that the ultimate doom of Edom is associated, alike in the prophecies of Baalam (Num. xxiv. 18) and in those of the latest of the Prophets, with the final judgments, which shall be executed upon all people, when "the tabernacle of David, which has fallen," shall be "raised up," and the "tents of Judah" shall be "saved," and "the day of the Lord" shall be "near on all the heathen." We submit, then, that that utter and eternal desolation of the land, and that extermination and final extinction of its inhabitants,—which Dr. Kalisch seems to consider as essential to the fulfilment of those prophecies to which he refers,—so far from affording the proof which he requires of the truth of prophecy, would rather support that view of it which he maintains, as a shrewd prognostication of the impending future, or as history converted into the prophetic form.

It would carry us very far beyond our prescribed limits were we to enter upon an examination of the remarkable course of reasoning, if such it may be called, as the result of which Dr. Kalisch has arrived at his conclusions respecting the date of the composition of the Book of Leviticus, which he assigns approximately to the year 400 B.C. We pass over this portion of his work with less regret, inasmuch as Dr. Kalisch's theory not only demands that many of the plain facts of history should be unscrupulously set aside, but is so directly opposed to the views of the majority of rationalistic critics of equal learning and research, that we think that in regard of this, as of many other of their details, we may safely abandon the conflicting theories to the mutual destruction which awaits, if it has not already overtaken them.

---

the uncle and successor of Jehoiachin, the monarchy of Judah came to an end. The sense he assigned to the Hebrew verb which is rendered "sit," in Jer. xxxiv. 30, may be illustrated by a reference to Zechariah xii. 6: "And Jerusalem shall be *inhabited again* (or *firmly established*) in her own place."

Digitized by Google

Nor is Dr. Kalisch more successful, in our estimation, in those portions of his work in which he has recourse to the process of critical disintegration: *i.e.*, in which he endeavours, by the detection of alleged discrepancies in the various portions of the Book of Leviticus, to establish its composite authorship, and to separate it into its component parts. We will illustrate this observation by reference to one or two instances.

In Leviticus i. 2 we read the following direction respecting the selection of animals for burnt-offerings: "Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them, If any one of you bring an offering to the Lord, you shall bring your offering of the cattle, whether it be of the herd or of the flock." Dr. Kalisch infers from the employment of the general word *korban* (*i.e.*, offering) that the reference is to *all* sacrifices, and, therefore, that according to the views of the writer, quadrupeds alone were "at first deemed sufficiently valuable to be admitted as animal sacrifices." But in ver. 14 we find the following direction given: "And if his offering to the Lord be a burnt sacrifice of fowls, then he shall bring his offering of turtledoves, or of young pigeons." The explanation of this latter verse, as given by Dr. Kalisch, is that when experience had taught that the poorer classes were excluded from the chief means of religious worship by reason of the costliness of the sacrifices required at their hands, the earlier law was relaxed, and that turtledoves and pigeons were accepted when sheep and oxen could not be procured. The inference drawn by Dr. Kalisch, from the comparison of the two verses, is that the 14th is a portion of the later legislation, and that it proceeds from the hand of a different writer or reviser.

On this method of reasoning we may observe as follows:—

(1) If we admit, for the sake of argument, that there is *prima facie* evidence that the direction given in ver. 14 is of a later date than that given in ver. 2, we might still argue that inasmuch as the wilderness legislation was undoubtedly modified, and, in some few particulars abrogated, previously to the entrance into the land of Canaan, so it is quite *conceivable* that the selection of victims for the burnt-offerings might have been restricted in the first instance to the herd or to the flock, and afterwards extended to turtledoves and pigeons, and yet that the whole of the legislation might have proceeded from the lips of Moses.

(2) It is in analogy with other portions of the Levitical legislation, as Dr. Murphy has observed, that the usual material should be prescribed first without any notice of the alternative which is allowed afterwards. We appeal, in illustration of this assertion, to Lev. ii. 2, iv. 28, and v. 6, in all of which cases we find one form of offering first prescribed and the alternative subsequently mentioned. But

Digitized by Google

(3) If neither of these explanations is thought to remove the difficulty (and, for our own part, we unreservedly reject the explanation first suggested), the passage will admit of the following translation, which involves nothing more than a slight departure from the punctuation of the Masoretic text: "If (or when) a man makes an offering unto Jehovah of (or from) the cattle, ye shall bring your offering of the herd, or of the flock." It is obvious that if this translation be admitted, the alternative afterwards mentioned of turtledoves, or of pigeons, not only affords no indication of a later date or of a different writer, but is in entire harmony with all which has gone before.

Whilst disposed, for our own part, to adopt the view which is taken by Dr. Murphy and other orthodox interpreters who adhere to the Masoretic punctuation, we submit that either the first or the third of the explanations above given will suffice as an *argumentum ad hominem*, in opposition to the inference drawn by Dr. Kalisch of a diversity of date and a diversity of authorship.

Dr. Kalisch appeals again to the direction given in Lev. i. 7, that the sons of Aaron were to "put fire upon the altar," which he compares with that given in chap. vi. 8—13, respecting the perpetual fire which was to be kept burning upon the altar; and he argues that the former direction would have been superfluous had both originated at the same time. Now it might suffice to reply, in answer to this objection, that inasmuch as the fire in this case appears to have been kindled in the ordinary manner, and not to have proceeded directly from heaven, there was a necessity, inasmuch as the priests were to do nothing without direction, that a command to that effect should be given to them. It is quite possible, however, as it appears to us, that there may have been need for this direction on other occasions than that on which it was first observed. We admit that Dr. Kalisch's objection to the supposition that the direction had reference only to the original kindling of the fire, founded upon the *general* application of the other precepts contained in the chapter, deserves consideration. We think, however, that the apparent inconsistency in this, as in so many similar cases, is not incapable of explanation. A careful examination of the direction given in chap. vi. 13: "The fire shall ever be burning (or shall ever be kept burning) upon the altar; it shall never go out (or be extinguished)," will show that it is given in close connection with the continuous burning of the sacrificial victim, as a type or symbol of the perpetual need and acceptance of the true propitiation, of the perpetual worship of God, and of the fellowship of His people with Him; and, it may be also, as a type of the "fire which is not quenched," and which must for ever "devour the adversaries." Now when we consider how often and, apparently, for how long a period,

Digitized by Google

the observance of the requirements of the Levitical law as regards sacrificial worship was, either by reason of necessity, or by reason of neglect, suspended, it will at once appear that there was need on each occasion of its revival that the original directions should be again observed: that the priests,—the sons of Aaron,—should again "put fire upon the altar," and "lay the wood in order upon the fire," and lay the several portions of the victim (as prescribed in chap. i. 9) on the altar, "to be a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord."[e]

It will excite no surprise, on the part of our readers, after the general view which we have already given of the principles of interpretation adopted by Dr. Kalisch, that he should reject *in toto* the *typical* character of the institutions of the Levitical law; and thus, as we believe, fail to discover the only key to their true meaning and their permanent importance. He readily admits, indeed, the "eminently logical" and "consistent" character of the Levitical system as expounded in the Pentateuch. He admits, also, that "its main office was *atonement*," and that the attributes of God upon which that office was based were "His *holiness* and His *mercy*." He admits, also, the *symbolical* character of the sacrificial rites and observances: in other words, that they were "visible embodiments of spiritual ideas." Thus: *e.g.*, salt, which was an essential ingredient in every sacrifice, was symbolical of life, of permanence, and of purity, just as leaven and honey recalled the ideas of corruption and of decay; and hence the injunction, "With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt," is found in immediate connection with the prohibition, "Ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the Lord made by fire." (Lev. ii. 11—13.)

We have no fault to find with Dr. Kalisch's definition of the word *typical*, as applied not only to the whole of the Levitical system, but also to very many of the events of Old Testament history. His words are as follows: "This (*i.e.* the typical explanation) regards the ceremonies and events of the Old Testament as the prefigurements of some corresponding doctrine or occurrence recorded in the New: it more especially supposes the Hebrew sacrifies and their rituals to foreshadow the person and nature, the life and death of Christ." (I. p. 142) We agree, further, with Dr. Kalisch that inasmuch as the reception of this view of the typical institutions of the Old Testament has exercised a very momentous influence upon "the formation of religious dogmas," it is a question neither uninteresting nor unimportant to investigate the value which ought to be attached

[e] It is possible that the word rendered "fire" may here denote lighted fuel, in which case it is needless to discuss the question whether the direction given in v. 7 refers to the first kindling of the fire, or to its maintenance.

Digitized by Google

to it. We have no fault to find in the brief review which our author takes of the Talmudical and Rabbinical mode of exegesis, a subject on which he is entitled to speak with authority.

But here our agreement with Dr. Kalisch ends, and we altogether dissent from the truth of his assertion that the history of the typical intention of the Bible was in many respects analogous to that of the Jewish school which he has sketched, and "the stages of advance nearly identical."

So far, indeed, from following in the exposition of the Bible, "the taste and usage of their time and people," the Apostles, following the example of their Lord and Master, rejected those vain traditions, the Jewish fables and commandments of men, by which the Word of God had been made of none effect; and being taught by God's Holy Spirit the hidden meaning of those heavenly truths, of which the types and shadows only had been displayed to Moses on the mount, they became able expositors of the new and better covenant; "not of the letter, but of the spirit," knowing that whilst "the letter killeth, the spirit giveth life."

Here, then, we take our leave of Dr. Kalisch, acknowledging freely and unreservedly the wide range of his reading and research, and the ability displayed in many portions of his writings; but expressing, at the same time, our full conviction of the untenableness of the positions which he has undertaken to defend, respecting the nature and design of the Levitical legislation, and of the wholly chimerical nature of the theory which he has espoused as to the dates of the composition of its respective portions.[1]

It is refreshing to turn from a work of so much patient labour and diligent investigation, ill-bestowed as regards the conclusions at which its author has arrived, and to turn to one written upon the same subject, in which, emerging out of the darkness of that abyss into which the theories of Dr. Kalisch would plunge us, we enter into the clear light of gospel truth clearly enunciated and powerfully enforced. The work of Dr. Murphy is one which must be diligently studied by those who would duly understand its meaning and appreciate its value.

Starting from the threefold proposition, that man is guilty, that God is holy, and that the doom of sin is death, Dr. Murphy proceeds to close the book of fallen nature and to open that of

[1] Those of our readers who are acquainted with the typographical characteristics of the works which emanate from the firm of Messrs. Longman will not need to be informed that those eminent publishers incur no further responsibility for the numerous errors and defects which abound in these volumes, than that which is involved in lending their names to the title-page of a work printed in Leipzig.

Digitized by Google

Divine revelation. Whilst assigning its rightful position to human reason he observes that its scope is "limited to intuition, experience, and inference," and that it cannot "by any telescope, or microscope of its own invention go beyond these." Hence the need of revelation: with revelation, however, reason has much to do. Reason "acknowledges its possibility;" reason "hears, understands, and estimates its credibility." And further, the possibility of the revelation involves, of necessity, "the wider possibility of a miracle, and this of creation and prophecy." "A logical mind," Dr. Murphy justly observes, "accepting revelation, will be found accepting, with equal readiness, all these kindred facts; not perhaps in the popular, but at all events in the Scriptural sense."

Having briefly but clearly stated the outline of the Gospel plan of salvation through the propitiation of the Son and the regenerating influence of the Spirit, Dr. Murphy proceeds to propound his view of the place which the Book of Leviticus holds in the volume of Holy Scripture, and of the light in which it is to be regarded as "the figurative exhibition of the way of salvation." "The book," he says, "treats of propitiation and purification. Propitiation involves the priest who mediates and the offering which makes atonement." His view of the most important of the sacrifices prescribed by the Levitical Law is briefly explained as follows: "It is manifest that there are three primary and stated offerings, and two secondary and occasional. The former are the burnt sacrifices, the oblation, and the sacrifice of peace, expressing the atonement, the benefit of atonement, and the enjoyment of this benefit; the latter, the sin-sacrifice and the trespass-offering, expressing the expiation and the satisfaction for an occasional sin of inadvertence." It is almost superfluous to state that there is the widest possible divergence between the views of Dr. Kalisch and those of Dr. Murphy, bearing on the subject of sacrifice in general, and of the design of the several offerings specially enjoined by the Levitical Law. The former of these writers regards the burnt-offering as denoting the offerer's absolute submission to the Divine sovereignty, the peace-offering as expressive of his gratitude for blessings enjoyed, the trespass-offering as imploring expiation for offences committed, and the purification-offering as marking the return of the state of purity after a period of uncleanness. Dr. Murphy, on the contrary, sets forth in the following language his ideas of the design of sacrifice generally, and of the place which these particular offerings occupy in the Levitical economy:—

"In the view of the sacred writer the sacrifice expresses not the subjective feelings of the worshipper in presenting it, but the atonement which the victim is to make in the purpose of God. The

Digitized by Google

burnt-sacrifice represents not the absolute submission of the offerers to the Divine sovereignty, nor God's unlimited sway over the destinies of man,—ideas which are foreign to the notion of sacrifice, and only akin to that of predestination; but the making of *atonement* and the opening of the way for pardon and *acceptance*. The sacrifice of peace is not necessarily a thank or praise-offering, an expression of gratitude for blessings received, but primarily the symbolic enjoyment of the blessings procured through an accepted atonement. The sin-sacrifice or trespass-offering does not exactly seem to implore forgiveness and expiation for offences committed, but exhibits the penalty paid, a redress made, for the faults of inadvertence in which holy men are overtaken. The sacrifice does not 'implore' but atone; and 'forgiveness and expiation' are not parallel, but the latter is the condition of the former. And it must be understood that a 'purification-offering' may be so called, not because it purifies, since its proper effect is to propitiate, but because it is offered when purification has taken place." (P. 22.)

Concerning the position occupied by the Book of Leviticus in respect of its relation to the New Testament Dr. Murphy speaks thus: "It is the ancient text of which the New Testament is the practical and exegetical commentary." He refers more particularly to the inspired exposition of the nature and design of the Levitical legislation as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where we find the interpretation of those typical acts and things which "point to that great event whereby eternal redemption was obtained."

It is no cause for surprise that when the Book of Leviticus is thus interpreted Dr. Murphy finds order and connection, though not always an adherence to chronological arrangement, where Dr. Kalisch discovers "illogical arrangement" and conflicting ordinances.

Whilst commending Dr. Murphy's Commentary on Leviticus to the favourable consideration of our readers, we must not be understood as committing ourselves to an unqualified assent to all the views which are expressed, or to all the statements which are contained in it. Thus, in dealing with the important and interesting subject of leprosy, Dr. Murphy does not appear to us to distinguish with sufficient accuracy between the two remarkable forms of disease which are commonly described under the common name of λέπρα (leprosy); the one a cutaneous disease analogous to certain forms of scrofula, and the other a disease of a far more malignant character, commonly known as *elephantiasis*. The distinction between these diseases is pointed out with much accuracy and minuteness by Dr. Greenhill in an interesting paper which will be found in the last number of the "Bible Educator."

Whilst agreeing entirely with Dr. Murphy in regarding the

Digitized by Google

prevailing type of leprosy amongst the Jews as a disease incurable by human skill, and probably as one of a much more formidable character, even in its ordinary form, than that which was familiar to Augustine, or to Isidore of Seville, we demur to the apparently unqualified statement that it was "infectious in the highest degree," as inconsistent, in our judgment, not only with the legitimate inferences which are to be drawn from the narratives of Scripture respecting Naaman and Gehazi, but also with the Levitical regulations respecting the victims of this disease. We presume, however, that Dr. Murphy did not design this statement to be understood without exception or qualification, inasmuch as he proceeds to speak of the "non-contagious leprosy" as one of the forms in which that disease exhibits itself.

We have left ourselves no space for further notice of a volume which we regard as a very substantial gain to our store of Biblical literature, and we add only that we trust that this is only a third instalment of the results of the critical and exegetical labours of the Hebrew Professor at Belfast.

CHRISTMAS BOOKS.

At the close of one year and the commencement of another, books throng in upon us which all claim a passing notice; but from the ephemeral nature of their contents, do not need lengthened review. We will, with some passing comment, dismiss them to public favour. A batch of them has just reached us from Messrs. Seeley. Foremost among these we will place "Chimes of Consecration," by the author of "Copsley Annals." It is a volume of very choice poetry, fragrant with holy thoughts, which will add to the deservedly high reputation which the writer has attained. Next we notice "Under the Cross." These are fragments from the journal of an invalid lady, written under grievous trial. We gather from the preface, prepared by the Rev. E. Garbett, that they have been translated from the French. After perusal of them we can confidentially recommend them to the sons and daughters of affliction: as the Editor truly observes, "The voice is that of pathetic suffering; but it swells even into the heavenly song of victory and praise." "Sunday Echoes of Week-day Hours" is a fresh volume by Mrs. Carry Brock: this time on the Epistles and Gospels. Those who are familiar with these pleasant and profitable books, will be glad to receive another; and we would suggest to those who are not, that they would do well to become acquainted with them. "Trespassers" is the production of the Rev. J. G. Wood. Under this

Digitized by Google

quaint title the author shows how a bird or reptile trespasses upon the realm which belongs to the fishes, and a fish trespasses upon that of the mammal. It is profusely illustrated, full of interesting and useful information, and well calculated for a present to young persons of superior intelligence, who may have some inclination for the marvels of natural history. The "Ancient Nation" is a by no means unsuccessful attempt, from the existence of the standing miracle "the Jew," a sign and a wonder to all nations, to deal with the objections current against the genuineness and authenticity of the Word of God, in a manner suited to the comprehension of young persons. Cavils such as those of Dr. Colenso are passed in review, and the difficulty suggested by them is dealt with. There is probably little original in the volume, but information is brought together, and presented in a pleasant and intelligible form. It can hardly be supposed that all young persons should be unscathed by these painful controversies; while therefore it is needless, prematurely, to initiate them into them, it may be convenient to know where solutions can be easily accessible. "Travellers' Tales" is intended for young folk. It abounds with illustrations, and mostly deals with mountain climbing, but not exclusively: some part of it relates to strange animals and strange places. It is written by the author of "Busy Bee," and will be attractive to young people. A "Boy's Kingdom" is yet one more of those tales modelled upon "Robinson Crusoe," which never seem to pall. We do not know whether they are meant to deter from the sea; if so, they are failures: but if, as we are a maritime nation, the object be to cherish the sacred flame of adventure among boys, they are just the reverse. The higher agony and suffering are piled in them, the more attractive they are. This one, by way of variety, has a woman and a baby cast ashore, as well as the boy, who is the hero of the story. There is a Newfoundland dog, too, so that the interest is well sustained. To these must be added "Dog Life," in which dogs are the heroes. It is illustrated by some exceedingly well-executed engravings after Landseer. This will be with many young people the book of the season. Dogs are almost universal favourites, and it teems with pleasant anecdotes concerning them. It is really, of its class, a very choice book.

"Floss Silverthorn" is by Miss Giberne; we cannot say that it could be singled out for any special pre-eminence over the multitude of stories and tales before us; but it is an ingenious tale and, like all the productions of Miss Giberne, inculcates lessons of piety in a manner suitable to the tastes and intelligence of children.

From Messrs. Nisbet we have "God's Work, and how to do it." It is a curious book; for the fortunes and loves of the heroine are intermixed with confirmation lectures, which she gives to pupils throughout the volume. The lectures are good and scriptural, and in due course the heroine is rewarded for her faithfulness in adversity by a full meed of prosperity. The story is founded on fact, illustrating the text, "A woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised." A more grave volume is "Clefts in the Rock," by Dr. Macduff. Its object is to set forth the grounds of safety and

Digitized by Google

security, comfort and peace, which are to be found in the adorable character and completed work of the divine Redeemer. Many precious passages of the Word of God are dwelt upon with great felicity. It will be a book welcome to those who love Christ. "The Christ of God," by Dr. Horatius Bonar, treats of the same inexhaustible topic. It is a valuable treatise, full of devout meditation on the attributes of our blessed Lord, expressed in the terse and pointed fashion peculiar to the author. We can most highly commend the manner and the matter of the volume.

The Religious Tract Society have sent forth a goodly array. Foremost among them are our old friends the *Leisure Hour* and *Sunday at Home*, somewhat more ornate in their exterior than in previous years. The contents, so far as time has enabled us to judge, quite sustain the well-won reputation which the previous volumes have achieved. It is no small homage to their merit that so many claimants to public favour have modelled their serials upon these excellent books. In both there is much useful as well as pleasant information, the contents of the *Sunday at Home* being of course of a more devotional character, befitting the sacred season. There has been manifestly great anxiety to produce what should be thoroughly congenial to a day holy to the Lord, but we could wish a yet stricter exclusion of what is not directly for edification. Still there are many holy and profitable thoughts interspersed. Our jealousy in this respect may be deemed extreme, but we feel bound to record it. Both volumes are filled with admirable illustrations, much enhancing their value. "Golden Sayings for the Young" is an exquisite volume, in large clear type. It is full of choice stories of very varied character, which will not fail to be attractive to intelligent children. A well-executed engraving is furnished with each tale, and a very handsome as well as profitable book is the result. For young folks of more mature age the "Realm of the Ice King" will be full of the deepest interest. It is a history of Arctic adventure, told with remarkable clearness, from the earliest attempts at exploring the mystery which shrouds the Polar region from the foot of the explorer, up to the most recent times. It is an ingenious thought to have reduced the essence of many volumes into one continuous narrative, perhaps suggested by the pemmican which sustains life in those desolate lands. We can accord a high meed of praise to the manner in which the task has been executed. This book is one of permanent value, and justly finds place on the Society's list, as so much of it is a record of Christian heroism. "Three Christmas Eves," and "Little Christmas and her Friends," are tales with a designation so appropriate to the season, that they demand immediate notice. They will be found very pleasant, and in every sense of the word seasonable reading for young folk, inculcating pure morality and kindly sentiment congenial to the holy time. "Glaucia, or the Greek Slave," is a well-told tale of early Christianity. We need hardly undertake to furnish any account of it, as many of our readers must be familiar with similar narratives; but we can safely commend it as likely to be both interesting and instructive to young readers. "Stories of the Old Romans" reproduces the well-known legends which older folk used

Digitized by Google

to believe as veritable history before the days of Niebuhr and Dr. Arnold. The aim of the writer, in which he has been successful, has been to point out "the nobler morality, the purer patriotism, the higher self-sacrifice taught in the Bible." Suitable engravings help to make it a very attractive volume. "The Grafton Family" transports us to Islington, and to scenes of commercial life. The story is well conceived, and will be found both pleasant and profitable. It will be found a very useful volume for parochial lending libraries, as it narrates features with which readers in these institutions would fully sympathize. We can strongly recommend it. "The Home Circle" is meant for a record of births, marriages, and deaths. There is room for three entries under each day of the year, and each day has its appropriate text. To many it will, when filled with the names of loved ones, be a very precious book. Each page has an illuminated margin. In company with it we may notice the Pocket-books of the Society: one, for elder folks, with much useful commercial information; the other, for young people, with details of a more miscellaneous character. "Christmas Cards" have become an institution among us of late years, harmless and pleasant enough. Those published by the Society may be especially recommended as beautiful, and a pleasant medium for conveying choice Scriptural texts from friend to friend. Some Book-markers, well suited for Sunday-school rewards, may also be noticed.

"True Hearted" has been forwarded by Messrs. Hatchard. It is a tale of fashionable life, fairly equal to the average of similar productions, but having the advantage over them that there is a religious vein throughout, which is indicated by the title. "This Troublesome World, or Bet of Stowe," by Lady Barker, is also from the same firm. The authoress of this weird story vouches for the truth of it. It is written with much ability, and will well repay perusal. We will not unfold the plot, which is a most romantic one; but will only add that truth is stranger than fiction. Genuine sterling piety characterizes the heroine through all her sad and wondrous fortunes. "The Shakspeare Birth-day Book" substitutes for texts from Scripture passages from Shakespeare. We do not quite see the merit of the novelty, nor the applicability of the quotations; but it presents a fair show. It is dedicated to the Princess of Teck.

"Little Boots" and "Little Boots grown older" is, we suppose, an American story; for there are incidents in the latter volume especially which we cannot fit on to any phase of school or college life with which we are acquainted. But the books are very readable, and will give innocent pleasure in a long dull evening: there is a wholesome tone throughout them. It may seem hardly right to refer to Mr. Saphir's "Lectures on the Hebrews" in such a connection as Christmas Tales: we simply notice its existence now as a valuable book, hoping to recur to it when the concluding series is published. There are, we trust, many to whom it would be a valuable Christmas gift. These books are published by Messrs. Shaw.

Digitized by Google

Since writing the foregoing, the annual volume of *Our Own Fireside*, *The Day of Days*, and *Home Words* have reached us from Messrs. Nisbet. We have received them so recently that we have not been able to bestow any critical examination upon them. We can however certify that they present a handsome appearance, and that the list of contents promises well, both for the entertainment and the profit of the reader. Whenever we have dipped into these pleasant volumes, which are highly creditable to the editorship of the Rev. Charles Bullock, whose portrait forms the frontispiece to *Our Own Fireside*, we have not been disappointed in what has fallen under our notice. There are profuse and well executed illustrations in all of them.

Old Jonathan, the District and Parish Helper, from Messrs. Collingridge, has long been a familiar friend in town and country. The present volume will quite sustain the reputation which this useful periodical has acquired.

The Year of Salvation. By J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., Professor at Utrecht. Edinburgh: Clark.—This volume forms a portion of the Foreign Devotional Library proceeding from the enterprising firm of publishers Messrs. Clark. It is intended as a household book of devotion: the part before us is for the "festival portion of the year," embracing the period between Advent and Whitsuntide. A short text is usually chosen, illustrated by some apposite and thoughtful remarks, which will be found both convenient and profitable, not only in the family circle but also for private meditation. The exposition of Scripture is evangelical, and quite sustains the description on the title page, that the volume contains "Words of life for every day." It is well translated, and may be confidently recommended.

The Christian Year. On the Imitation of Christ. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875.—These volumes are exquisitely prepared editions of well-known works with which almost all religious persons are familiar. If they had been published singly we could have bestowed unmixed commendation upon them. By an ingenious compromise the offensive alteration which was foisted into the later editions of Mr. Keble's "Christian Year" has been got rid of. It occurred in one of the poems for the State Services, and these have been omitted; and this edition is now, comparatively speaking, a safe one,—not that we endorse all the teaching in it. Unfortunately however these unobjectionable works are put forward as the heralds of a library of "Spiritual Works for English Catholics." The subsequent volumes, so far as they are announced, are to be the productions of Romish saints. It would seem that some translations of these effusions lately put forth have had passages omitted which would be offensive to English Churchmen. In the opinion of the present translators there is now "a more intelligent view of Catholic devotion," and these excisions are no longer necessary. We are sorry to hear it, if it is the case, and it is a plain duty to warn our readers against a series which promises to be undiluted Romanism.

A Theory about Sin. By the Rev. Orby Shipley. London:

Digitized by Google

Macmillan. 1875.—This book contains many foolish and unscriptural statements. It is concocted by Mr. Orby Shipley. We are sorry for those faithful priests and people who after hearing the lectures, asked to read them. Some, we hope many, were not so curious. We should be still more sorry for any who may have been influenced by the erroneous teaching in them. As an example, by no means a solitary one, we quote for the amusement of our readers, the following ludicrous illustration of the Deadly Sin of Gluttony:—"It is related of a nun walking in the garden of her convent, that her eyes fell on a lettuce, and that she was tempted to the sin of gluttony. She yielded to the sin, plucked the lettuce, and ate it greedily. But she yielded fatally, for as she was eating a devil entered into her, and she became possessed with torments. Help was procured from a neighbouring Abbot, who was sent for to exorcise the fiend; and as soon as the holy man entered the garden, and before he was exorcised in the holy name, the fiend begun to cry out by the mouth of his victim, 'What have I done, what have I done, that I am thus to be cast forth? I was sitting quietly on a lettuce, and she came and greedily swallowed me up, and I have taken possession of her.'" Can Mr. Shipley have been addressing not the faithful, but the foolish, and have adapted his teaching to them?

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Church Memorials and Characteristics. By the late William Roberts, M.A., F.S.A. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1874.—Under this somewhat affected title, which is we think a mistake, we have presented to us a Church history of the first six centuries. The bush obscures rather than proclaims the good wine; for the volume really is a most valuable conspectus of the times of which it treats. The plan too is ingenious. Instead of calling upon the reader to wade through the Malebolge of early heresies, which to young students in theology especially is a most irksome task, and in which many of them get hopelessly confused, a clear and concise account is given of all the most conspicuous names who were leaders of thought in the period of which the author treats. With them of course are connected the views which they maintained and the doctrines which they taught. It is a "biographical Church history." Many matters are thus passed over which find place in other Church histories; but what is supplied is amply sufficient for ordinary readers, and is intelligible and instructive. If we do not very much mistake, the volume will be found very useful by young men reading for Orders. We may add that Mr. Roberts held sound views, and was not disposed to exalt the Church at the expense of Christianity. He clearly points out the corruptions which disfigured it more and more as it receded from Apostolic purity, until at length it developed

Digitized by Google

into the full-blown mystery of iniquity displayed in the Church of Rome. The story as it passes under review is a sad one: the treasure was tainted by the earthly vessels through which it was transmitted; had it not been for its divine origin and essential purity it must long since have become a mass of corruption. The Editor, Mr. Arthur Roberts, has done his part carefully and with filial reverence. The Author himself, once a Fellow of Corpus, Oxford, was in his day an excellent scholar; he was the Editor of the *British Review*, and of the memoirs of Hannah More. He also published several legal works, which were of considerable value and reputation.

Fireside Homilies. By the late Henry Alford, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co. 1875.—A small volume of chat with his family on Sunday evenings, proceeding from Dean Alford. The contents were originally published in the *Sunday Magazine*, but will bear reproduction. On many important points we have ever differed from Dean Alford; but we have also ever been conscious that there was much that was genial about him: he was also a man of many, perhaps of too many, accomplishments. Even in the present volume we do not agree with everything; still, even with some deduction, it will be pleasant to read. We can quite believe in the reality of the entourage of these homilies: the laity may not be sorry to catch glimpses of the pastor's fireside when the duties of the Sabbath-day are over. We can rejoice in believing that although there may not always be so much poetic feeling or artistic refinement discoverable, yet the Dean's pages furnish a fair presentment of many holy and happy scenes in other Christian homes besides his own.

The Rent Veil. By Horatius Bonar, D.D. London: Nisbet. 1875.—Few names are better known to Evangelical Christians than Dr. Bonar. Many have found comfort and edification from the valuable writings with which he has enriched the Church of Christ. We need not, therefore, undertake to dwell upon the merits of the present publication. A most solemn topic is handled in it in a manner suitable to its importance. Much spiritual teaching will be found in it. While some in their self-sufficiency shrink from the blood of Christ, and almost (although not in so many words) deem it an unholy thing, Dr. Bonar does not. While some think that they soar above sin, and no longer need that blood, Dr. Bonar does not. We therefore cordially recommend his new volume to public favour.

Scripture Proverbs Illustrated, Annotated, and Applied. By Frances Jacox. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.—The wise man tells us, what our own experience tells us,—that it is not good to eat much honey. Still honey is a pleasant thing, and partaken of in moderation, is beneficial rather than harmful. The illustration may help us to pass judgment on Mr. Jacox's book. It would be a very cloying process to sit down and read it through, but for an idle hour of honest relaxation, trifling over a few pages now and again will prove an agreeable resource. From all quarters the compiler has gathered together quotations, incidents, and anecdotes, which he

Digitized by Google

brings to bear with considerable felicity upon texts of Scripture of a proverbial character. Out of the ample stores he has provided illustrations will occasionally be found serviceable to the preacher; but all persons may derive instruction from the light reflected upon God's Word by the sayings and doings here recorded, though many who uttered and performed them did not care to retain Him in their thoughts, or were ignorant of Him. We must however add there are stories and references which although harmless, should not have been allowed where Holy Scripture is concerned. They jar against good taste and feeling. To say the least, a more appropriate place for them would have been in some book like Southey's "Doctor." In juxtaposition with texts of Scripture they are inconvenient, though there is no trace of intentional irreverence.

The Paraclete. London: King. 1874.—This is an essay on the personality and ministry of the Holy Ghost. It is in many respects a most remarkable production. No clue is given to the author. From the absence of what may be termed perhaps professional style, it would seem not improbable that the author is a layman; but we profess no certainty upon the point. In the first part of the work, which is expository and affirmative, the writer occupying the Christian standpoint, undertakes to trace the outline and to establish the argument for the personality and ministry of the Holy Ghost, as a doctrine upon its revealed and practical side comprehensible by reverential reason. In the second part the inquiry is critical and controversial, dealing frankly and intelligently with objectors such as Hobbes, Hume, Huxley, and Stuart Mill. It is the conviction of the writer,—and in this we agree with him,—that a great battle between faith and unbelief has yet to come. He holds that it is immediately impending; and certainly there has recently been much to warrant him in this assertion. In this conflict his volume will be useful. We have read it with profound interest: there is much advanced in it that is both able and ingenious, bearing the stamp of originality. The writer's arguments will be much relished by devout and thoughtful persons, and ought to command consideration from the impugners of Christian belief. Over and above the course of the argument many most suggestive passages occur which will be full of interest to the student of God's Word. If our space permitted we would gladly quote some passages in support of our favourable judgment. It deserves to be extensively known, and we shall be glad if our notice calls the attention of our readers to it. It ought to find circulation among the clergy especially; but the lay reader will be edified.

The Companion Psalter. By Professor Birks. London: Seeley. 1874.—This addition to our Hymnology comprises 450 versions of the Psalms, of which one-fourth are original, the rest are from various sources: nearly another fourth being by Dr. Watts. In his preface Mr. Birks complains, and with some justice, of the neglect into which psalms have fallen as contradistinguished from hymns. He dwells too upon the risk which is hereby run "of divergence from the Scriptural standard of piety into a sensational or mediæval style of worship." This risk has, we are sure, been

Digitized by Google

keenly felt by many who have taken heed to what they have been singing in public worship. Thanks to the mobility of Romanizers it is hard to find a hymn book in which the service of song does not contravene the evangelical teaching from the pulpit. In each pot of ointment there are dead flies, and many excellent men are satisfied if they do not stir them. Mr. Birks' volume is free from this objection. It can be introduced safely into a congregation. It has, too, further claims to attention from those who are not scared from the subject by the ghosts of Eterwhold, and Hopkins, and Tate, and Brady of olden time. Many admirable versions of the Psalms will be found in it which have considerable poetic merit and fairly express the devout feelings of the soul. Among these Mr. Birks' own contributions may be noted as well deserving commendation. In his paraphrases he has not unfrequently supplied those direct references to our blessed Lord which are perpetually implied in the Psalms. These go far towards making the Psalter a fair substitute for a hymn book, though he disclaims the wish to displace any now in use. In this we differ from him. It would be a great gain if his volume were the substitute for many,—indeed, for most now in use, though perhaps not for all.

Life and Correspondence of the Rev. John Clowes, M.A., formerly Rector of St. John's Church, Manchester, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Longmans. 1874.—*Outlines of Swedenborg's Doctrines. New Edition. London: Longmans.* 1873.—No name is attached to the latter of these two publications, but it is the work of Mr. Clowes, and nearly seventy years ago was animadverted upon in the *Christian Observer*. It is a singular proof of what some would consider the undue comprehensiveness and forbearance of the Church of England, that Mr. Clowes, holding the heretical doctrines of Swedenborg, and maintaining them in publications expressly advocating them, should not only have been permitted to minister within her pale, but should even have had—such was the laxity of the times in which he lived—the offer of a Bishopric made to him, which he declined. Yet it must be borne in mind that, with all his mysticism and peculiarity of belief, he was a man of eminently holy life and conversation; and conscientiously attached—after his fashion—to the Church in which he was a diligent and exemplary worker at a period when there was much deadness all around. Hannah More and Wilberforce, differing from him as they did, entertained a sincere regard for him. Unfortunately the good he did has passed away, we hope, with him; but the evil which he taught still survives in the mischievous teaching which ensnared him, as it has ensnared many excellent men, and marred their usefulness in the Church of Christ. If we view Mr. Clowes apart from his heresies, there is much to admire in him; but if we take him and his works together, we learn from him to "cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils."

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

As we write, the year is waning fast. Christmas is at hand. There seems a peculiar appropriateness in placing the nativity of our blessed Lord at the period when our year is drawing to its close and another is about to open; for He Himself was the intermediate point between the old dispensation and the new,—between the old world and that in which our lot is cast. Of Himself, He said, "Behold I make all things new." With each recurring season of the Nativity there is, therefore, not only recollection of the past, but anticipation of the future. At the present crisis that future is an anxious one, but the consolation of the Christian is that the Lord who has blessed His people hitherto is an unchanging God. With hope, therefore, and with confidence, although not without perplexity and anxious thought, we look into a future so pregnant with serious consequences to our beloved Church. There is much that is ominous in the condition of public affairs abroad, rather than at home, which might well cause disquiet, but still no immediate convulsion needs to be apprehended.

Some anxiety has been felt about the health of the Premier, but public attention has been more concentrated upon the utterances of his great rival, which, perhaps from being unexpected, have caused confusion and dismay in the Church of Rome, which continue unabated. Statements, rejoinders, and counter-rejoinders have been multiplied. Good only and not harm can result from public attention being drawn to the exaggerated pretensions and blasphemous claims made on behalf of the Papacy. Prince Bismarck, in his place in the German Chambers, has quite recently most unequivocally declared that the war between France and Germany originated in Romish intrigue and in connection with the Vatican Council. The blood of these nations is in the skirts of the gorgeous vestments which her ecclesiastics wear.

The trial of Count Arnim has been brought to a conclusion. More recent disclosures go a long way to justify what seemed to be harsh procedure. It is difficult, nay we think impossible, to acquit him of serious breach of trust, unless a different code of morality be adopted for foreign statesmen and diplomatists to that which is recognised amongst ourselves. The sentence of condemnation marks displeasure rather than a vengeful spirit.

Most unpleasant instances of Turkish fanaticism have recently been brought under notice. The revived spirit of Islam displays itself in bigotry and persecution, so far as it can venture to do,

Digitized by Google

and serious difficulties are placed in the way of Christian missionary effort. This is probably the best attestation of the substantial success which, despite all obstacles, has attended to it. It is remarkable to find this fanaticism blazing forth at a time when hardly without disguise, Russia is accumulating armaments, which may, unless checked by the intervention of the Western Powers, overwhelm the Ottoman empire in final ruin.

The Presidents of the French and American Republics have both been addressing their Assemblies. The topics are of interest to the nations respectively, but rather concern domestic welfare than the world in general. The resumption of specie payment in America and the preservation of the status now existing in France, form the staple of their harangues. University education, which is in a most deplorable condition, and is at the root of the moral gangrene of the nation, has since occupied the French Assembly.

It is with unfeigned satisfaction that we record a fresh condemnation of Mr. Mackonochie in the Court of Arches, for his continual lawlessness at St. Alban's. He is doing the Church of England good service, whatever his intentions may be, as an unmistakable exponent of the necessity for further legislation to restrain silly excess, offensive to the spiritual instincts of the nation.

In the interests of public morality we rejoice to find that the Lord Chamberlain is making some effort to repress the gross indecency flagrant in theatres. In these hot-beds of vice a pitch of shamelessness has been arrived at which is not only disgusting to persons of ordinary refinement, but is almost below the level of French immorality. When William Wilberforce and his friends met in counsel to try to extirpate the evils which were then a scandal to England, and were eating like an ulcer into it, they concluded that the giant evil of slavery might be dealt with, but that the condition of theatres was hopeless. Like the liquor traffic, it seemed to be a curse which could not be restrained. We are afraid that there has been retrogression rather than progress in the viciousness of theatrical exhibitions since his time.

The death of so able a defender of the truth as the late Bishop of Ossory and Ferns, Dr. O'Brien, should not pass without respectful notice. He was a Prelate of whom the Church of Ireland might be justly proud.

December 20th, 1874.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 2. FEBRUARY. [1875.

EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES.—WORSHIP.

It is a peculiar feature of the times in which we live that so much attention is given to things which concern worship. The air is full of religious opinions, controversies, services, efforts, experiences; and men are freely handling, and curiously questioning, and wonderingly asking what these things mean. And if men's ideas of worship were sound, this fact would be in itself a sign of much good that has been done amongst us; for real worship is the fruitage of faith, the outcome and expression of the life of God in the soul. But many men continue worldly while they talk and think about these better things. The age has not always grown more reverent by becoming more interested; and so it may be well to set out afresh the old subject,—as to what Worship is, why, and how, and by whom it is really offered in the presence of Him who will not judge according to the appearance, but according to the "hidden man of the heart."

And as we study this question in the light of the Gospel statements of it, we are arrested by the phraseology employed: how the words used to state it practically explain and settle it. Thus the devotion of an animal towards its master (προσκυνεῖν) represents the consciousness of distance between the Creator's glory and the creature's dependence upon Him. And memory tells us how Elijah "cast himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees." (1 Kings xviii. 42.) The attitude of a servant is indicated by another expression (δουλέυειν), and we think of the Psalmist's service: "As the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until He have mercy upon us." (Ps. cxxiii. 2.) There is worship in waiting:—

"They also serve who only stand and wait."

Digitized by Google

The habit of mind out of which it comes is indicated by the veneration (*εὐσέβεια*) which the most favoured children must ever feel towards God their Father.

The attitude of body in which its true humility is expressed will be seen by the Apostle's expression, "I bow my knees;" and the elevation and expectancy of a soaring faith will be gathered from that other account, "I will that men pray everywhere, *lifting up holy hands*, without wrath and doubting."

So, again, the catholic comprehensiveness of worship will appear, not only from the representation of angels and spirits made perfect in the upper and inner courts of the one great sanctuary, but chiefly from that grand account of it, by which we know that worshippers are limited to no place and no condition, for our own blessed Lord has told us, "The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him."

There may be words without worship, and there may be worship without words; and, perhaps, the very highest act of earthly worship is that in which a holy joy and an all-absorbing admiration and an all-entrancing love have so flooded the soul that praise cannot flow out in speech. Thus when the heart has opened all its secrets before God's eye of grace and tenderness, or has laid bare its wants and its weaknesses in the felt presence of Him who knows all, the very silence of the appeal constitutes its sublimity, and the unspoken supplications are felt to be those which most eloquently set forth what the soul would have and would believe that God will give. The measure of a true prayer's force is the power by which it is presented. To have conceived the idea clearly which we mean to bring before God, and to have clothed it in words fitting and sufficient for its right and reverent expression, is but the lower part of that blessed process by which saints hold fellowship with heaven. To put the petition in, to lay it down before the mercy seat, to stand by it with heart faith, and know that it must be heard and answered,—this is the energy of Worship, faith's upper work of sitting with Jesus in the heavenlies. Now concerning worship,—that real service which redeemed souls render by virtue of their union with Jesus and the consequence of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, "whereby we cry Abba Father,"—one thing is quite clear.

I. *It cannot be done by deputy.* In words, this truth may be accepted by all; and yet there may be some doubt, if in reality it be not much forgotten. Thus, in our modern times, it has been often said that the highest act of worship is in the Supper of the Lord. And it *is* a holy and happy service when we

Digitized by Google

follow the express command of Christ, and come to Him in this simple ordinance, in which the soul feeds upon Him as the body on the bread and wine. But by whom is that worship offered? Is it by minister or by people? If it be said by minister, then error has crept in, even upon this holiest subject, and we must stand apart and say that in such misapprehension we can have no share. Put the distinction of this worship upon the ground of offering Christ to the Father, make its dignity to come out of the dignity of Him who is offered, and out of the ministerial authority of him who offers, and you do but endorse an error, and encourage a mistake, out of which in every age of the Church mischief has been found to come. Every communicant can do and must do what only is to be done in that holy ordinance. No priest can minister for the people, that is, in their name or in their place. The very idea that the celebrant is doing on earth what Jesus does in heaven, is founded on a mistake as to what Jesus does. He is our Advocate, Mediator, Intercessor, and High Priest, but He now presents no sacrifice. That He did below, and "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Now He claims for His people, and conveys to all who are in living union with Him, the full effects and the guaranteed blessings, which His own one offering upon the cross secured; and minister and people, in the holy ordinance, stand on the common ground of the equal worship, and at the common level of felt inability to present anything but themselves, their souls and bodies, their service and their praise, acceptable unto the Father only in virtue of the acceptance of the Son. Make the Holy Communion spectacular, make it some service of the minister at which the people are only or mainly to assist, make it a sacrifice, however qualified and fenced by explanations which reach the ear but touch not the heart, and you will degrade your worship. Without intending it, without acknowledging it, without even rightly understanding it, men do practically put this worship into the priestly hands; and that is to corrupt the ordinance, misplace the celebrant, and make the people lowered and not raised in their communion worship.

Call this sacramental service the highest form of Christian worship, then dwarf and cripple this by making it the service of an official order, and the consequence is sure to be that through all the secondary and subordinate engagements of it, worship must be lowered, chilled, dulled, degraded, having the form of godliness without its power.

II. *It must not be overladen with ceremonies.* It would be an interesting inquiry, which each man may set up in his own conscience, as to how much in his worship goes to please him-

Digitized by Google

self and how much is offered to honour and glorify God. We hear of hearty services, warm services, and we may well ask whom are they designed to gratify,—God or man? So long as we are in the flesh our worship must accord with our double character, and in it both soul and body, heart and head and hand may join. But here, as in every other service, the material must ever be kept in due subordination to the spiritual; and if by reason of the beauty of a ceremonial, or the thrilling ecstasy of an accompaniment, we find as a matter of fact that the language of the soul is unheard and the prostration of the heart is unfelt, then, and in precise proportion to the degree in which the mechanical outstrips the spiritual, have we fallen, and not risen in the service we so tender unto the Lord. This is, in truth, the test over all the departments of religion. If the preacher forgets his Master and exalts himself, if the pastor seeks the favour of the flock and not the honour of its Owner, if the steward looks askance to his own gain when all ought to be concentrated upon that which makes his charge more worthy of the Master's praise,—in any and all of these conditions of service there is a grievous blemish and a dangerous deceit. It comes to a worship of self instead of the worship of the Almighty. Under such circumstances there may be abject confession of sin in attitudes of deep humiliation and language of penitent pathos; but the heart may be dead and the conscience hard all the while. To the fleshly ear, the tones of praise may thrill and quiver, so that tears flow and lips tremble and hands are locked, and enjoyment seems exquisite and complete. Yet in all this God may be neglected, and gratitude towards Him may fail.

This may be, of course, only an abuse of that which may in itself be good; but if experience shall show that the emotional does and will keep down the devotional,—that worship in its palmy days has not been in its purest forms,—then cautious men will at least make very solemn inquiry, not about others so much as from themselves, whether the fact may or may not be that under the gorgeous externals the inner warmth has not escaped.

And this is a question to be well considered, above the reach of parties, and away from the strife of tongues. Worship is the heritage of the universal Church, and the study of it is to be drawn from the whole tenour of the Gospel history. All would be lifted up, if worship were placed in its own higher and holier region. All will be brought nearer in the household of faith, if they all get closer to the Father's footstool. And so it is with facts and not with feelings, with effects and not with speculations, that we are dealing here. Clearly, worship falls when the

Digitized by Google

slovenliness of irreverence and neglect has made its surroundings and accompaniments such as we should be ashamed of in the presence of a parent or a King. For all such disregard of the proprieties, wise men can have no defence. But mischief may be found in extremes on either hand. The requirements of an æsthetic worship, elaborate ceremonials, elevated musical appliances, may bring in,—and, as facts prove, often must bring in,—elements that are not of spiritual and really Christian sort. There may be performers and observers,—exquisitely trained utterances from the tongue which send a tremor over the frame, —and attracted ears and fixed eyes, because the beauties are all present which the natural man enjoys. But, oh, if the spirituality has ceased,—if the great God shall see "devotion's every grace, except the heart!"—then the great design and purpose have been missed. Better far a simplicity under which devotion thrives, better far an unlettered reality of heart-praise and love, than a cultivated refinement which goes no deeper than the surface, and has no higher action than on matter and on man. The whole energy of the universal Church may well be directed to this one question,—how to keep the subtle element of that holy fragrance which ever will rise with acceptance before our God, and yet not to throw away the alabaster box in which it may be held, and with which it should be ever associated, when grateful love pours out its offering in the Saviour's presence.

And if practical examination shall indeed find out that the form is displacing the spirit of our worship, then it becomes the Church's obvious duty to say that even when the sacrifice is painful, we cast out the wheat to save the ship; we return to simplicity of manner, because we cannot part with the sincerity of expression which the heart and not the body gives. In every part of worship there must be reality, individuality, spirituality; and the flame must come down from heaven, or the savour of the sacrifice will be offensive and not acceptable before God.

And now we may turn to a third aspect in which the question of Worship may be viewed.

III. *It must not be divorced from a holy intelligence and a sanctified common sense.* Every highest branch of praise should be traceable to a hidden sort of faith; and when men soar into the upper regions of enjoyment, they should never lose consciousness that all is reasonable and safe and true. There are certain times and circumstances under which an excitement has risen which is neither healthful nor trustworthy. As when devotion becomes dependent upon some creature who calls it forth, and so rises or falls, flashes or flickers, according to the presence or absence of something which is not God. No doubt we are and must be affected, while we are in the flesh, by things which are

Digitized by Google

painful or pleasing to flesh and blood; but the devotion which the Holy Ghost creates will live and glow by its own inherent grace. If the building shoots up high above, it must have its foundation deeply and solidly laid before you can reckon that it will stand. It is easy to indulge in overwrought imaginations; it is common to find out what another has felt, and then imitate its every expression except that one which explains it all. The Church has often suffered from spasmodic excitement; but it never can be injured by a sobered, solid, Scriptural enjoyment of God's favour. The electric flash may be followed by the tempest rain; but the river which really makes glad the city of God, and that leaves a green mark all along the valley of human existence, is that which gurgles ever out from beneath the throne in heaven, and quietly, deeply, richly yields its water to fill the pools and freshen all the plants as it go downwards to its rest and its perfection in the ocean of goodness, out of which it had evaporated as grace.

Religion is eminently a reasonable service; and worship, which is the highest expression of religion, is a product of the Spirit and of the understanding also. A man should think before he prays, that he may be well prepared so to ask as not to ask amiss; and a man should remember before he praises, inasmuch as there will never be a real acknowledgment, if there has not been a real appreciation of the blessings given. Upon the whole subject, therefore, we may arrive at these conclusions:—

First,—that Christian worship must be raised into the higher region in which its holiest services are to be centred; out of the region of supplication, blessed and bright as that always is, it must be lifted up into the loftier sphere of praise; and so, as selfish considerations recede and grateful emotions are fostered, the soul becomes conscious of a service which rises into an adoring homage, and becomes eloquent in an admiring praise.

And further, Christian worship must spread over a wider area. It will be not less a thing in which individuals rejoice, because it is also a thing in which multitudes can join; and so instead of the worship of a faithful few, we must long to see and contrive to secure the worship of the rejoicing many. The closet prayers will lead on to the sanctuary praises; and Church after Church, country after country, catching the grand idea of the universal family and citizenship and priesthood of the redeemed, the waiting people will be pleading together before the central throne. Then like a corona of glory the burning Churches shall be grouped round Him who is the common sun, and the sound of the many hearts sending up their concordant praise will swell out with a pathos and a power at which even a drowsy world must wake.

So, too, with the right expression in which the homage of soul

Digitized by Google

shall be made known. There will be the old words of love and truth and joy; but also the language of the life, and the testimony of the service will show how all is genuine and sincere. Men who wait are worshipping, while they mark the very first tokens of the Father's will. Men who watch are worshipping, as they hold their silent and it may be solitary station, while the city is asleep; for they look from their towers and know that the Eye that never sleeps is upon them still. Men who work are worshipping; for they are remembering God, representing God, respecting God, while the highways of the busy world are full of the crowding masses of careless men. And men who war are worshipping; for they stand as the servants of the great King, and trust in the well-tempered armour, and wield well the tried weapons of truth; and they are heroes who never flinch, God's own host who follow wherever their Captain leads, and their's is the homage of a holy zeal and the devotion of deathless love,—the martial music of an army of the saints who have no fear.

JOHN RICHARDSON.

A QUIET CORNER OF ENGLAND.

A Quiet Corner of England. Studies of Landscape and Architecture in Winchelsea, Rye, Romney Marsh, etc. By Basil Champneys, B.A. London: Seeley, 1875.

THIS is a very exquisite volume. It will, of course, have especial interest for Kentish and Sussex folk, within whose precincts the scene of Mr. Champneys' studies will be found; but it has, by its intrinsic merit, claim upon a wider circle. There is no pretention to learned antiquarian research, nor is there much of that romance, which, if the author had chosen, might have been produced, with little effort; for, quiet corner of England as it is now, it has been the theatre of some fierce contentions in the days of old, and, in later times, many a weird and ghostly story lingers amidst the wild and desolate villages of the Marsh. Smuggling is not, to our modern apprehension, connected with aught but what is most contemptible; but the students of a literature, now well-nigh forgotten, could bring forward tales of harrowing interest, and of ferocity, which have, ere now, sent a thrill of horror through the country. One of these, a little while ago, we came across in an old magazine, the details of which are too frightful even to allude to; but the array of troops evoked, and the solemnities of justice set in motion, lent a dignity to vulgar crimes. Very wisely, we think, Mr. Champneys has

Digitized by Google

refused the temptation of all sensational writing, which he might so readily have indulged in: the result is, a most fascinating book for any true lover either of art or nature. With most commendable fidelity he has reproduced the features of the neighbourhood exactly as they would present themselves to a person gifted with refinement and intelligence, with, of course, some special references of his own profession as an architect, which lends additional charm to his book. The "Quiet Corner," with all its quaint fragments of the past, and its simplicity, so little savouring of present pretentiousness, fills the mind as a choice Dutch or Flemish picture of rural life feasts the eye. Of course, Mr. Champneys represents his scenery *au mieux*. He visited it in the early autumn, when the falling year was congenial with all around him. We have known it then, and can remember that it was pleasant. But we have also known it under other aspects: in the wild winter, and in the fierce spring, when fierce winds and driving showers of rain were sweeping over it. It would require a wealth of imagination, at these seasons, to struggle against the discomforts of Romney Marsh; the temptation would be to hurry on and to forget its existence.

In the author's honest jealousy, that the modest and homely architecture of our own country should receive more general appreciation, we heartily concur. There is much good sense in his remarks; but we think he has hardly made allowance for the influences which drive so many from England abroad, to seek enjoyment which might be found nearer home. It is not in our opinion so much that Englishmen deliberately prefer exhausting foreign marvels and neglecting what is immediately within their reach. The fact is, that when the momentary pause in the hard struggle of official or professional life annually recurs, and a brief well-earned holiday is at hand, whither is the worn-out athlete to betake himself for rest and refreshment, previous to a renewal of the battle of life? In these days of penny postage, of telegraphs and of railroads, where is the still and sequestered nook in England to which he could betake himself without fear and trembling, and without the risk of finding himself at any moment in harness and at work, when his fondest wish was to be out at grass? It is our solemn conviction, that in the most remote corner, and in the most isolated village of Romney Marsh, the client would manage to discover the weary lawyer, a sudden summons would evoke the physician to the bedside of patients, or proofs and demand for more copy would assail the jaded literary man. Painters may perhaps enjoy immunity, and wander at their own sweet will in home scenery, often of surpassing loveliness, furnishing as choice subjects for the pencil as the Continent can afford. But all men are not painters, and hence the rush

Digitized by Google

abroad,—hence scenes of foreign interest are more familiar to multitudes of Englishmen than the most favoured portions of their own land. Men turn aside from the lakes to linger around Lucerne, and swarm upon every Swiss mountain without having seen Snowdon, or ventured on the towering heights of Ben Nevis.

But do they find rest? Perhaps not: but there is a change of toil and occupation. If quiet is not secured,—and it can be,—yet as it were another set of muscles is called into play, and that is comparative reward. The daily round, the accustomed task are exchanged, the burden is shifted to another shoulder and is carried more easily. The Straits of Dover, fortunately not as yet tunnelled, have the same property of causing all troublesome pursuit to cease, which it is fabled running water has to intercept witches. Perhaps with the loss of his mare's tail, Tam O'Shanter reaches Calais or Boulogne; but there he breathes again. He could not do so, either at Rye or Winchelsea, even though the grass might be growing in their streets. In England,

"Post equitem sedet atra cura;"

the unpleasant double shrinks from crossing the channel, as though it were a martyr to the *mal de mer*.

But our speculations, although suggested by Mr. Champneys' theories, have carried us too far away from his pleasant volume. He first dwells upon the general features of Romney Marsh. In his remarks he exhibits a just appreciation of the features which characterize it: they may be read not only with pleasure but with profit by those who would wish to understand what are the component elements of natural beauty, and may serve to direct intelligent observers how to gather out from scenery before them the peculiar characteristics which may make up its loveliness, and what may be termed its personality. In the course of them he notes correctly that "Rye was a timber city, and grew up fortuitously on an irregular plan; Winchelsea was a stone city, laid out regularly upon a plan of geometrical compartments. Rye church was a conglomeration of schemes and styles mostly of a rude vernacular character; Winchelsea church is an almost ideal gem of uniform character and of exquisitely studied detail." Of the latter church most beautiful illustrations are given, which fully bear out Mr. Champneys' professional enthusiasm. Our recollections of it are mixed up with the memory of its late Rector, a man of considerable ability as a preacher, but of still more considerable eccentricity. He was a most ultra-Calvinist, but at the same time a most zealous High Churchman, pure and uncompromising in his Churchmanship, while the idol of Dissenters, who flocked from all quarters to sit under him, entranced with his uncompromising enunciation of his creed when, as often

Digitized by Google

happened, he preached from home. Many are the strange stories which have survived concerning him. One, although so grotesque as hardly to be tolerable, we may yet venture upon, for the solemn, almost awful admonition embodied in it. When repeating the Te Deum one Sunday morning he paused at the close of the sentence, "Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all *believers*," and to the astonishment and perturbation of all present,—much enduring as they were,—exclaimed, "What think you of that, you hypocrites!" Without presuming to question the sincerity of the religious profession of those who may light upon this anecdote, yet we would venture to say to many who have often joined in this solemn ascription of praise to the Lord Jesus Christ, "Reader, what reason have you for believing that Jesus has opened this kingdom for *you?*"

The desolation of Winchelsea, which Mr. Champneys dwells upon, when we remember it, it would be difficult to exaggerate: it is peculiarly a spot in which the *fallentis semita vitæ* might be trodden. In discussing Rye Church, Mr. Champneys evidently finds himself in a difficulty. We suppose he did not trust himself to dwell upon the massive communion table of Spanish mahogany at the east end of the church, but makes allusion to high pews, and almost admits tolerance for a three decker which, when we remember the church, towered high above the congregation. To his correct taste an unrestored church, redolent of past antiquity, even though encumbered with incongruous additaments of a later age, is something refreshing, after a ceaseless round of modern churches, or restored churches, which like Gyas and Cloanthus, are hardly distinguishable from one another. Although himself an architect, and therefore of course prepared to build churches, and when necessary to demolish old ones, there is sufficient reverence in his mind to make him at least doubtful of the propriety of destroying what has a character of its own, in order that the affectations of the day may be conformed to. We suspect that modern architects have in manifold instances been even more contemptuous of the monuments of their predecessors and the methods which they employed, than were the builders of the middle ages. It may be what Mr. Champneys terms chivalry, or regard for rarity; but with singular delight in the masterpieces of mediæval architecture we have considerable fondness for the substantial buildings, thoroughly English in character, which were hallowed with a more rational worship than that which is exhibited in many of the more pretentious erections of our own time. We think they have been often unjustly depreciated, and certainly they have in many cases been frightfully disfigured by mistaken efforts to introduce what may justly be termed modern innovations. We quote the following

Digitized by Google

passage as a fair example of the author's style and mode of thought:—

"An unrestored church has about it all the charm of infinite possibilities unrealized. All that the past has left is there; all that the future can do for it may be created by the imagination. It is not only in questions of restoration that we hesitate to discount the possible for the actual. It is an intelligent and harmless amusement, both for professional and amature architects, to effect restorations of the most thorough and complete kind on the tablets of the brain, or even upon paper. I know of few more interesting pastimes than for a number of architects, archæologists, and admiring *dilettanti*, to visit an ancient building and there to enter upon a tournament of imaginary restoration, provided only that there is an absolute predetermination on the part of its owners and guardians to carry out no single one of the suggestions. Otherwise the game is played with too heavy a stake to be an innocent amusement, with a property to wit of future ages of quite immeasurable value."

From Rye Mr. Champneys descends into the Marsh, on the villages of which he makes many pleasant notes, as he passes through aisles and chancels of churches formerly pressed unscrupulously into the service of the contraband. He dilates with enthusiasm upon a cupboard which he met with in an inn in New Romney. He had discovered another in a more perfect state in another house in Kent. This leads him to moralize on those who "without any consciousness of enlightenment or taste, and without ambition of advancement or change, are content to live as their ancestors lived, and by a quiet undiscursive communion with external nature have acquired a natural unconscious love for and contentment in beautiful things, apart from the restless phases of connoisseurship and fashion."

If we may have seemed to linger unduly upon this pleasant volume, or to have given it apparently more importance than it deserves, we hope we may be pardoned. It has awakened in us many recollections of the past; not only in Romney Marsh, but in many other sequestered nooks in Sussex and in Kent, we too have felt something of the delight which made Mr. Champneys' autumn excursion so gratifying to him. If out of materials which seem to be unpromising so much interest can be created, it is not the fault of England if pleasure cannot be extracted from it. There are other quiet corners in which those who are fortunate enough to possess sound minds in sound bodies may derive much enjoyment of a pure and refining character. There is the feast spread out, if the appetite be not wanting. Writers like Mr. Champneys will help to stimulate it.

Digitized by Google

"NON PROGREDI, EST REGREDI."

The duty of honest and loyal Churchmen in the present crisis.

ON all hands we are told that the Church of England is about to pass through a crisis such as has not been experienced during the last 200 years of her chequered history.

This is probably the case, and it behoves all true sons of the Reformation to be up and doing, lest the opportunity be lost and one more fatal step be quietly taken towards suppressing some of those liberties so dearly bought by the blood of martyrs,—towards divorcing the intellect of this couutry from its religion, and alienating the laity from the services of the Church.

There is no Church in the world which has such a career naturally open to it, if only it be faithful to the fundamental principles of the Gospel. All earnest workers in each widely different sphere of labour feel that, with God's blessing, all that is wanted is greater elasticity in things indifferent,—a greater liberty to use extempore prayer, more recognised occasions and opportunities for the employment of pious laymen in spiritual work. Every earnest movement which has arisen within the Church has been compelled by its inherent vigour to break through the trammels of the Act of Uniformity, or else to seem to discredit the stated services of the Church, by throwing all its energy into extra services held outside the Church,—in school-rooms, Bible-classes, prayer-meetings, and the like. The introduction of hymns into every available place in the service, supplies an illustration of an infringement of the Act which may be said to be universal.

It is not therefore to be desired that the bonds of uniformity should be drawn tighter, the services of the Prayer-book remaining as before. On the other hand, it is intolerable that a certain amount of liberty and elasticity, which was claimed for practical purposes and generally acquiesced in, should be appealed to as a precedent, and made the specious excuse for the introduction of a liberty, or rather a license, to change the whole character of our services, and, in matters of essential importance, to re-erect a basis of doctrine which it was the express business of the Reformation to pull down.

It is already becoming apparent that in many of the meetings called together lately by the Rural Deans, in obedience to suggestions from the Bishops, the evangelical party have been outwitted by the clever tactics of their opponents, and have given their votes either for the maintenance of the *status quo*, or for a certain latitude of interpretation of existing Rubrics, on the strength of the pleas put in against the enactment of a more

Digitized by Google

rigid uniformity. A compromise has in this way been obtained, which, if it extend to the counsels of the Church at large, will constitute a distinct step in what we hold to be the wrong direction, and will furnish a new and quasi-authoritative standing ground for the worst features of Ritualism.

It mattered little that the Canons allowed a cope to be worn in Cathedrals on high festivals, so long as its use was practically confined to a coronation; it mattered little that the words "standing before the table" existed in a rubric, as long as no one occupied that position any longer than was necessary for the ordering of the elements; it mattered little that the word "priest" appeared in many places of the Prayer-book, as long as its use in any significant sense was obsolete, or expressly relegated to the Roman Church.

But that these expressions and provisions should be resuscitated,—invested with prominent significance of a doctrinal character,—and then, when general indignation has been aroused, defended on the ground of an elasticity desirable for these times,—this is a position of affairs which must not be allowed any longer to pass unchallenged.

As a mere question of compromise, if these things are to receive any authoritative sanction,—and, after what has taken place, if they receive no distinct condemnation, the absence of such condemnation will certainly be pleaded as equivalent to a sanction,—then, we too must claim a like express sanction for all those portions of our system not expressly prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.

Again, if the chasuble is to be allowed as a distinctive vestment at Holy Communion,—an *enormous* step in advance on the unbroken custom of the Church for 300 years!—we have a right to insist, on our parts, on changes of an equally pronounced and significant character. As a matter of mere compromise, it will be no equivalent for the permitted use of such a dress to be told that a "surplice, hood, and stole" (we refer to the questions propounded by several Bishops, but we do not know where they get the stole from; except as covered by the "vestment," there appears no possible justification for its existence in the Church of England) are "a sufficient vestment for those who desire no other." That is plain enough already, and it is mere trifling to affect to make a solemn pronouncement on the subject.

It is true that an effort is being made to tide over the present storm, by declaring that these strange vestments and ceremonies are matters of indifference, and carry with them no doctrinal significance. Jesuitism itself could go no farther. Why then make such a fuss about them? And do we not know that the

Digitized by Google

moment their use was secured, a desperately different story would be told? Then they would be held forth as triumphant vindications of the so-called "catholic" character of the Church of England! It is perfectly idle, nay, it is flagrantly dishonest, at one moment to parade these things as the natural and inevitable symbolism of a sacrificial theory, and at another to take refuge in their alleged "indifference."

They do mean doctrine, or they mean nothing. They mean the dragging forth of every doubtful expression, every ambiguous rubric, which can possibly bear a Romish or mediæval gloss, and the persistent working of them up together into a marvellous whole of doctrine and practice, as abhorrent as possible from all those fundamental principles of which the Reformation was the expression.

They do mean doctrine; and the only fair equivalent to us would not be trumpery concessions of what we are entitled to already, and of things against which there is no law, but the optional disuse of several parts of our formularies which have become invested with a meaning which we are quite certain, from the nature of the case, the compilers of our Liturgy could never have intended. We should demand to be set free from repeating at the Baptism of Infants the words, "*Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is regenerate.*" We should demand that the references to confession should be modified; that the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick should be omitted; that the words, "Whosesoever sins thou remittest," etc., should not be said categorically to every newly-ordained presbyter, even though they might be recited in the body of the service; that the answers made by sponsors should be of a less formal and of a more real kind, they being only required to promise that, as far as in them lies, they would see that the children were Christianly and virtuously brought up.

We know perfectly well how propositions and demands of this kind would be met. A clamour would be raised that now at last we were found out; that we had always been unfaithful to the Church, and that now we appeared in our true colours; that they were ready to stand by the Prayer-book as it was: that it was ourselves who were demanding changes.

But it is quite time that we showed ourselves, in all the boldness of conscious honesty, to be wholly indifferent to these superficial criticisms. It is time to say plainly that we were content with the Prayer-book as it was, interpreted by the universal custom of the Church, in subordination to the great ruling principles of the Reformation, out of which the English Prayer-book, as a whole, plainly sprang; for though it be eminently conservative of ancient piety, it is as plainly destructive

Digitized by Google

of superstitious error, whether patristic, scholastic, or mediæval. But if we were content with the Prayer-book *as it was*, this is no reason whatever why we should be content with what these innovators wish to make it,—with what, in fact, it will become if their wholesale reading between the lines is to receive any recognised sanction whatsoever.

Baptismal regeneration is a crucial point. Let us illustrate what we mean in this one matter as a specimen of the rest. We know for certain that the words in the Baptismal Service cannot have been meant to carry with them any *opus operatum* theory about the sacrament, because they were not words remaining to us from the old services, but drawn up as indeed the whole service was, by the reformers themselves; and if there was one thing more than another involved in the Reformation, it was the utter demolition of the *opus operatum* theory. Nor can we for a moment suppose that those who drew up the service, if they could now see the use and application to which their words have been put, would counsel any other course than their immediate removal from the service. It is perhaps impossible to say exactly in what sense the regeneration of every infant was intended by them to be affirmed: it is easy enough however to point out in what senses it was *not* intended to be affirmed. The charitable hypothesis has been very generally adopted. It seems probable however that a formal and forensic sense was uppermost at the time,—a view with which the technical and formal character of the answers made by sponsors *in the child's name* very well agrees. Moreover, since throughout the Prayer-book it is usual to express the same thing in at least two equivalent clauses, it is most probable that the whole meaning of the word "regenerate" is covered by the words immediately following, "and grafted into the body of Christ's Church." Another thing also is plain: that whatever difficulty has arisen, has arisen from the desire of the compilers of the service to press into their service every passage of Scripture connected with holy baptism. It is possible that in so doing it did not occur to them to distinguish sufficiently between the conditions of infant and adult baptism.

We have accepted the service, subject to the teaching of Holy Scripture and the guiding principles of the Reformation. If these are to be thrown over, and scholastic or mediæval theories substituted, then the service becomes to us an entirely different thing, and it is time we demanded an alteration. And as with this matter of baptismal regeneration so with the rest: we accept the Prayer-book as it was traditionally interpreted up to thirty or forty years ago. What we object to is the burlesque parody which has lately been obtruded upon us as a faithful representation of its teaching, by the aid of large additions and antiquarian resuscitations.

Digitized by Google

And in this attitude *the country is with us.* The reception of the Public Worship Bill in both houses of Parliament is nothing less than a call to us to make our voices loudly heard: it is an opportunity which, if we lose it, may never be vouchsafed to us again. Nothing is more remarkable than the interest disclosed in religious questions. When so many avenues of temptation are alluring men to unbelief, it is an imperative duty incumbent upon the Church to set her house in order, and offer to the nation once more, as at the great Reformation, a pure and Scriptural form of doctrine and worship.

Always excepting the small but noisy body of partizan adherents of the new movement, it is open to observation how few of the laity have ever really received and assimilated the teaching even of the old High Church party. That teaching has ever been distinctly clerical, and so considered. It has been respectfully tolerated as a harmless professional groove of thought; tolerated in consideration of sterling worth and a high standard of professional duty, but tolerated only as a theory; and always, as now, rebelled against when made the basis of real intercourse with souls.

The effect of the new movement has been three-fold. It has opened the eyes of many old-fashioned High Churchmen to the real tendency of their cherished theories; it has driven multitudes unwillingly into the open arms of Dissent; and it has artificially created, on a small scale, a new school of red-hot partizans of the sacerdotal theory. Its gradual development moreover has been so insidiously managed, as to entangle unawares many of the clergy, who are now driven for consistency's sake to take some liberal or neutral ground, when in their hearts they would be deeply thankful to be free to speak out in decided abhorrence of the practices now so freely indulged in. Not so long ago it was only a crusade against "slovenliness and coldness in public worship;" and so gorgeous churches were built, choirs were brought down into chancels, communion tables vested and then constructed like altars; now it is eucharistic adoration, auricular confession, immediate direction, indicative absolution.

Many then are the wistful eyes directed to the Evangelical members of the Church, who have not bowed the knee to this new Baal; many are the secret calls for help; and it is certain we shall not be true to ourselves, to our beloved Church, or to England herself, if we do not seize this great opportunity presented to us by Providence, not only to secure our old liberties, but to vindicate our principles as the historical and true principles of the Book of Common Prayer.

The Prayer-book of 1549 is loudly demanded back again as the exponent of the true mind of the English Church. Let us

Digitized by Google

as loudly and persistently demand the Prayer-book of 1552, as the more matured product of the Reformation, with such revision, additions and modifications as may suit the altered circumstances of the case. Hitherto in each revision, at the Hampton Court and Savoy Conferences, the clerical element has been allowed to prevail, and with the most disastrous results. To the unconstitutional proceedings of Laud may be attributed, in no small degree, the Rebellion; and let us remember that it was due to Laud alone that modern Ritualism was possible, for it was by his sole authority that the holy tables in parish churches were permanently set altarwise. It was due to the Bishops and the Commons in 1662, that an Act of Toleration had so soon to be passed to protect the schisms which the Act of Uniformity had evoked. That the settlement of 1662 caused the secession of 2.000 clergymen, and was so greatly responsible for the terrible difficulty and embarrassment of modern nonconformity, is surely sufficient reason for regarding it with something short of blind veneration. True, it is the settlement which we ourselves accepted; but in common with the country at large, we accepted it in a very different sense to that now sought to be put upon it; moreover, those were times of peace, and to accept a settlement generally acquiesced in, is a very different thing from refusing to modify it when once disturbed.

It cannot, *under present circumstances*, be too strongly insisted on, or too widely known, that the settlement of 1662 was of a reactionary and retrograde character, and not a natural, consistent, and gradual development of the Reformation. For 110 years the Prayer-book of 1552, with certain slight modifications, had been the authorized use of the Church of England. The alterations made in 1662 were all of a character to bring back, so far as they went, the doctrines and usages of the first Prayer-book. The answers made to the Puritans at the Savoy Conference were, many of them, evasive and disingenuous, and it can scarcely be doubted that had the Bishops concerned dared, they would have gone even further in a retrograde path, from their pronounced abhorrence of some of the tendencies of Puritanism.

A remark of Dr. Cardwell, very sagacious indeed, as far as it goes, and one which we should perhaps have acquiesced in some years ago, is well worth quoting. After detailing (in words which always seemed to us to prove too much, and to suggest that the affairs of the Church were the mere creatures of circumstances) the manifold difficulties in the way of any further revision of the Liturgy, he thus writes of the revision of 1662:—

"The Revision of King Charles II., memorable as a passage of history, is no less instructive as an example. Beginning in a sense of thankfulness that the times of trouble were at an end, in a

Digitized by Google

generous spirit of forgiveness for past sufferings, and in a prevailing disposition to renounce private interests and to include all reasonable worshippers within one common ritual, it terminated in a stricter interpretation of religious faith, in more rigorous requirements of ecclesiastical discipline, and in an increased amount of civil disabilities." [a]

No doubt it did: but all we can say is, so much the worse for the revision and for the credit due to those who carried it out. Moreover, Dr Cardwell takes no pains to inquire why it was so. It does not seem to occur to him that the attitude of the representatives of the Church in the full triumph of the Restoration (we are speaking as much of the laity as of the clergy) was wholly different from the charitable and liberal professions of the same persons while yet the Restoration was an unaccomplished fact. He makes no account either of the terribly low type of morals and religion which the Restoration brought with it. Moreover, circumstances, to which he appears to attach an exaggerated importance, have wonderfully and rapidly changed since he penned those words; and perhaps, if he were recasting his valuable work now, a very different tone might be observable in the weighty and measured words of its concluding chapter.

We cannot expect to win back nonconformists by a single effort, in a day, as it were, now that they have a history of their own, a recognised position, an elaborate organization, and considerable property; but we can at least endeavour, now that a suitable opportunity has arrived, to remove from our services all those unnecessary or doubtful passages which have proved a conscientious stumbling-block to their union with us. If we could show them that, in the region of doctrine and belief, no logical bar existed, a favourable opening would, at least, have been made for future negociations of a more practical kind, to be entered into as opportunity offered. There was no portion of Bishop Wordsworth's letter to Mr. Beresford Hope, we are sure, which attracted wider sympathy, than that in which he pleaded for more regard to be shown to our fellow-countrymen and brethren of the orthodox dissenting communities, than to those foreign Churches from which our own Church has nothing to learn.

At all events let no man be deceived into the idle notion that an attitude of neutrality now, and of concession to the accomplished facts of Ritualism, *on the specious ground of greater elasticity*, will have the remotest tendency to enlarge the area of the English Church. When Ritualism has got all it wants, then we must expect an iron bondage of arbitrary and conventional

[a] Cardwell's History of Conferences, p. 464.

Digitized by Google

ecclesiasticism of the narrowest kind. The mischief already done amongst the younger members of the Church, who have come under its baneful influence, is incalculable: give it but a little firmer standing ground, and it will emerge from its comparative obscurity in renewed vigour and in its true colours. Then indeed, unless it be already half paralysed and half enslaved, the country will rebel in earnest, but the rebellion will cost us our national Christianity. If secession there must be, better far that a few who are not of us should go out from us now, than that a few years later the whole framework of the Church should hopelessly collapse. But it is re-assuring to think how few worth keeping would desert from our ranks if the law of the Church were once plainly and seriously vindicated in a Protestant direction.

One more remark and we have done. It will be alleged that proposals such as have been advanced will narrow the Church, and will therefore press unfairly upon the liberty of those High Churchmen who have sought Holy Orders under the present system. To this we reply that no proposals we should care to make in the way of revision would have the effect of narrowing the boundaries of the Church. For any one that might possibly be lost by their adoption a hundred would be gained.

There is all the difference in the world between proscribing certain doctrines, under penalties, and simply removing from the formularies of a comprehensive and national Church certain misleading expressions, which have the effect of seeming to enforce such doctrines as part and parcel of the teaching of the Church. If the words alluded to above, which apparently affirm the regeneration at that particular moment of each child presented at the font, were removed to-morrow, the effect of that removal would not be to deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration: it would only be a measure of relief to those who doubted in what sense those words were intended to be taken, and who clearly perceived that there were some senses in which it was plain that they could not be meant to be understood. In other words, if regeneration does invariably occur in baptism, whatever may be meant by it, the mere removal of the express declaration that it does so could not prevent its still occurring, and could not interfere with the freedom of anyone to hold and believe that it did so occur.

No doubt these omissions would have a gradual effect on the general belief of Churchmen, and we might reasonably entertain every hope that the sacerdotal theories built upon the expressions at present retained would soon die out. Still, as regards the present generation of High Churchmen, no injustice would be done, and if these traditions were strong enough to perpetuate

Digitized by Google

themselves without any direct encouragement from the formularies of the Church, we, at all events, could have no more to say.

In reality, we have not the smallest fear that they could be able to do so. Evangelicals would no longer be fighting with their hands tied by unfortunate ambiguities, and the plain Scriptural truth would assert itself with a power unknown before: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free;" "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." *An unreserved appeal to the New Testament* (the precedents of twilight and dark ages resolutely set on one side) would re-unite in one phalanx of faith and love at least nine-tenths of English speaking Christians throughout the world. May God hasten the day!

BAILEY'S LIFE OF THOMAS FULLER.

The Life of Thomas Fuller, D.D., with Notices of his Books, his Kinsmen and his Friends. By John Eglinton Bailey. London: Basil Montague Pickering. 1874.

THE resemblance which is generally recognised by those who are competent to form an opinion on such a subject, between the times which immediately preceded the Commonwealth and our own, imparts a special interest to the biographies of those persons who then acted a conspicuous part on the stage of civil or of ecclesiastical history. Amongst those actors few are entitled to a higher post of honour than the illustrious Thomas Fuller, the "prime favourite author" of Southey, and the man whom Coleridge deemed worthy of a place with Shakespeare and Milton, with De Foe and Hogarth; in regard to all of whom he says that "England may challenge the world to show a correspondent name."

This great antiquary and Church historian, who is best known to posterity as the author of "The History of the Worthies of England," and "The Church History of Britain, from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year 1648," was born in the year 1608, at Aldwinkle, St. Peter's, between Thrapston and Oundle, in Northamptonshire, of which parish his father was the Rector. From his earliest days Thomas Fuller seems to have been devoted by his father to the work of the ministry, in which many members of the family had already engaged. In so doing the elder Fuller, whether consciously or unconsciously, dedicated his best gift to the service of the sanctuary, and thus escaped the condemnation afterwards pronounced by his son upon those who

Digitized by Google

"reserved straight timber to be beams in other buildings, and only condemned crooked pieces for the temple; so that which was found unfit for city, camp or court, not to add ship or shop, was valued of worth enough for the Church."

One of Fuller's favourite authors, during his childhood, was Foxe's "Book of Martyrs." "When I was a child," he says, "I was possessed with a reverend esteem of them, as most holy and pious men, dying martyrs, in the reign of Queen Mary, for the profession of the truth; which opinion having from my parents taken quiet possession of my soul, they must be very forcible reasons which eject it." In allusion to the detractors of these great and good men, Fuller writes as follows in the year preceding that of his death; and we commend the verdict of one so competent to form an enlarged and enlightened opinion on this subject, to the consideration of those superficial and unscrupulous writers in recent times, who have presumed to sit in judgment upon men with whose writings they are profoundly ignorant,—with whose cause they have no sympathy,—whose difficulties they are unable to appreciate,—and the distinctive articles of whose creed they have learned to brand as heresy: "I confess," writes Fuller, in 1660, "I have formerly met with some men who would not allow them for martyrs, making them little better than *felons de se*, wilfully drawing their blood on themselves. Most of them I hope are since convinced in their judgment, and have learned more charity in the school of affliction."[a]

When he was about twelve years of age Fuller was admitted at Queen's College, Cambridge; of which College his uncle, Dr. Davenant, was at that time the head. Fuller seems to have been peculiarly fortunate in his teachers and (with that sense of gratitude which is inseparable from true greatness of mind), in after life bore willing testimony to the benefit he had thus derived. Mr. Bailey justly describes Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Davenant as a man who had strong Calvinistic leanings; but, by some accidental error, whether of the press or otherwise, which will doubtless be corrected in subsequent editions, he adds that "he was supposed to have an inclination to Arminianism," and that he "strongly advocated the doctrine of universal redemption" (p. 77). Mr. Bailey adds that he was held in great repute by his nephew, and that to Davenant's school of churchmanship Fuller ever tenaciously clung.

Fuller seems to have made the best possible use of his time at the University. It was said of him that "The College was a sphere wherein his reluctant abilities had room to exert themselves, so that he filled the eyes of that University with a just

[a] "Worthies." Chap. iii., p. 9.

Digitized by Google

expectation of his future lustre." But, at the same time, he was not so much engrossed as to prevent his making many friendships which proved lasting. In 1624 Fuller's undergraduate life came to an end, and he took his B.A. degree, it is stated, with universal credit. The next few years were spent in preparing for the Master's degree, for which, at this time, a higher course of study, with three years' residence, was required.

During these years the nation at large was awakening to a sense of the immensity of the approaching struggle; and we may imagine how Fuller, in the midst of his books, must have felt that the time was coming when it behoved every earnest-minded Englishman to consider well the line of events, and to decide on his own course of action. In 1628 Fuller took his Master's degree. He was so young at the time that we find it recorded that "such a commencement was not within memory." Several reasons are given why Fuller, in spite of the brilliancy of his career and in spite of the efforts of his uncle, Dr. (now Bishop) Davenant, to obtain for him a Fellowship, was not elected to one at Queen's College. It is stated by one of Fuller's biographers that there was a College statute prohibiting the admittance of two Fellows at the same time from one county; and that as there was already one Northamptonshire man holding a Fellowship at Queen's, Fuller was thereby rendered ineligible. However this may have been, it is certain that Fuller's connection with this College was soon afterwards severed, and in 1629 he was admitted at Sydney College. Here his career seems to have been prosperous and happy. It is said that his character of "the good Master of a College" in the "Holy State," was largely drawn from various teachers under whom he had studied.

It is pleasant to find whilst so many old friendships were ruthlessly broken, and so many near relations estranged through the espousing of opposite sides in the great civil war, that Fuller, through all the vicissitudes of after-life, preserved several College friendships without regard to the politics of the friends in question. The University calendar of this period furnishes many illustrious names, the owners of which lived on terms of friendship with Fuller. Milton, Waller, and Jeremy Taylor were all resident in Cambridge at this time, and were all more or less acquainted with Fuller. Jeremy Taylor, with whom he was afterwards associated as Chaplain to the Royalist troops, is particularly mentioned as his "respected friend."

In 1630 Fuller was presented by the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College to the perpetual curacy of St. Benedict's Church, in Cambridge. Whilst holding this piece of preferment, he is said to have attracted the attention of the University by his remarkable power as a preacher. But in the same year

Digitized by Google

the plague broke out with great violence in Cambridge, and as the members of the University were, in consequence, dispersed, Fuller must have soon lost that portion of his congregation which was most capable of appreciating his powers.

His first published works appear about this time. In 1631 he published a poem entitled "*David's hainous Sinne, heartie Repentance, heavie Punishment;*" but before this a short poem had emanated from him, of which the subject was, "The Birth of a Royal Prince and Princess." Mr. Bailey remarks that it must be confessed that Fuller possessed in a full degree "all the faults of that vicious literary age,"—such as incongruous allusions, odd metaphors hunted to death, and far-fetched conceits. But whatever may be the judgment of posterity as to the place the poetry of Fuller deserves to fill, it is evident that he himself either found pleasure in composing verses or believed himself to be successful in the art, for during the next few years we find many productions of a similar nature proceeding from his pen.

In the year 1634 Fuller was appointed to the Rectory of Broadwindsor, in the county of Dorsetshire. Here he is said to have readily gained the affection of his parishioners, and to have striven hard to exemplify the character of "the good parson" in the "Holy State." The stormy days of the civil war were now fast approaching, and it was on the subject of the Sabbatarian controversy that Fuller let drop words which surely deserve to be engraved on the hearts of all those whose lot is cast in days of disputes and controversies: "Sure I am," he said, "those are best Christians who least censure others and most reform themselves." In spite, however, of the well-nigh absorbing interest of public affairs at this time, it was during his residence at Broadwindsor that Fuller found time to write those two books,—"The Holy War," and "The Holy State," by which, in Mr. Bailey's words, he "acquired permanent literary reputation at a bound."

The high esteem in which Fuller was held by his parishioners at Broadwindsor, will appear from the fact that on occasion of his journey to Cambridge to take his first degree in Divinity, he was informed that four of his chief parishioners were ready, "with his good leave," to "wait on him to Cambridge, to testify their exceeding engagements; it being the sense and request of his whole parish."

The scholarship displayed by Fuller in the "disputations" customary on such occasions, increased his reputation in the University, and he received his Bachelor's degree "with grand applause and commendation." It appears to have been at this time that John Nevel,—one of the six persons who received the degree of Bachelor of Divinity together with Fuller,—was publicly reproved by Dr. Ward, who acted as Moderator, for

Digitized by Google

advocating views, which at this time found much favour with some of Laud's party. The account given by Dr. Ewes, who was an eye-witness of the proceedings, in his "Autobiography," is as follows:—

"I departed early on Monday, July 6th, for Cambridge, to the Commencement, where the next day one Nevel, a young impudent scholar, being a Fellow of Pembroke Hall, and answering the Bachelor of Divinity's Act in the morning, maintained openly justification by works, and that the very outward act of baptism took away sin. His brazen-face asserting of these Popish points . . . was abhorred by myself and all the orthodox hearers in the Commencement House; and Dr. Ward, sitting Moderator the same day, openly rebuked the same Nevel for preaching those gross heresies. . . . I supped at night in Sydney College with the same Dr. Ward, when we both lamented the times that this wicked Nevel durst so impudently and openly maintain the vilest and most feculent points of all popery." [b]

Fuller was still at Broadwindsor when the necessities of King Charles I., arising out of the Scotch war, left him no other remedy than to summon the Parliament usually known under the designation of "The Short Parliament." This happened in April, 1640, and at the same time that memorable Convocation was convened the fruits of whose labours were embodied in the well-known canons of 1641. Thomas Fuller was one of the unfortunate number of clergymen who constituted this assembly, being elected Proctor for the diocese of Bristol.

In the third volume of his Church History (as reprinted in 1837), Fuller gives an interesting account of the proceedings of this Convocation, "the mediate transactions" of which, so far as he could ascertain, had been "embezzled," and in which it was ordered that none present should take any private notes in the House. After a Latin sermon in the choir of St. Paul's by Dr. Turner, chaplain to Laud, Dr. Stewart, the Dean of Chichester, was chosen Prolocutor. On Friday, the 17th of April, both Houses of Convocation met at Westminster, in the chapel of King Henry VII., when Archbishop Laud addressed them in a Latin speech of "well nigh three-quarters-of-an-hour's" duration, concluding with the intimation that his Majesty reposed so much reliance in the integrity and ability of the Convocation that he had empowered its members with his commission, "the like whereof was not granted for many years before, to alter old, or make new canons, for the better government of the Church."

The opinions of the members of Convocation as to the use which they should make of the power thus granted to them were

[b] "Autobiography." Vol. ii., p. 124.

Digitized by Google

widely opposed,—some being in favour of its full exercise, whilst others dreaded the temptation "to be over-tampering in innovations." Whilst things were in this state of agitation the Parliament was suddenly dissolved, and "from this very time," as Fuller remarks, with his characteristic terseness and quaintness of expression, "did God begin to gather the twigs of that rod (a civil war) wherewith soon after He intended to whip a wanton nation."

On the day after the dissolution, 6th May, 1641, the Convocation assembled, as was generally supposed, with a view to its dissolution, when, "contrary to general expectation," a motion was made to proceed with the new canons which had been proposed; and shortly afterwards a commission was brought from the King, by virtue of which Convocation was warranted to sit, "not in the capacity of a Convocation, but of a Synod, to prepare the canons for the Royal assent thereto." Hereupon an earnest protest was made by about one-third of the members of Convocation, in which Fuller appears to have joined, against a proceeding so "ominous, and without precedent," as the revival of a Convocation after the expiration of the Parliament together with which it had been summoned; and it was not until a legal instrument was produced, signed by the Lord Privy Seal, the two Chief Justices, and other Judges, that the dissentients appear to have been so far satisfied with the legality of the proceeding as to confine themselves to oral protests against it, but yet not to dissever themselves from it; "the rather," as Fuller adds, "because they hoped to moderate proceedings with their presence."

This Synod was contracted into a select Committee of some six-and-twenty, besides the Prolocutor, for "referring matters as to the propounding and drawing up the forms" of those canons which were afterwards, as Fuller believes, thrice voted upon publicly in the House; which canons, however, Fuller did not think it necessary to record in his history, "partly, because being printed, they are public to every eye; but chiefly, because they were never put in practice, or generally received."

There is, however, one of those canons to which the controversies of the present day impart a more than ordinary amount of interest; and it was,—according to Heylyn's account of this Convocation, in his life of Archbishop Laud,—an account which differs in some particulars from that of Fuller,—with special reference to the framing of this canon, that the select Committee of twenty-seven, to which we have just referred, was formed.[c] The canon to which we refer is entitled, "A Declaration Con-

[c] See "Cyprianus Anglicus, or the History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury," by P. Heylyn, pp. 406—7. London, 1671.

Digitized by Google

cerning some Rites and Ceremonies," and it is said by Heylyn to have been framed in consequence of a message delivered by the Prolocutor from the House of Bishops, desiring the clergy "to consider the best expedient for inducing an uniformity in the Church about the situation of the Lord's Table, the receiving of the blessed Sacrament, and the due reverence to be used in the house of God, and to prepare a canon to that purpose if they found it necessary."

The points thus suggested for discussion were, according to Heylyn's account, "seriously debated, every man speaking his opinion on them, when it came to his turn, without interruption." In summing up the results, the Prolocutor declared that "the far major part had appeared for placing the Lord's Table where the altar stood; the drawing near unto it to receive the Sacrament; and the making of due reverences at the entering into the church and going out of it;" and having put it to the question whether a canon should be prepared or not, the question was carried in the affirmative, "without any visible dissent." Heylyn proceeds to notice the proposal of a canon by "one of the clerks for the diocese of Bristol," who is supposed by Mr. Lathbury, as well as by Mr. Bailey, to have been Thomas Fuller, and observes that it was "disliked by all the company but himself." When the difference between the views of Heylyn and those of Fuller are taken into account, and also the controversy which had been waged between them previously to the period when Heylyn's account of the Convocation was written,[d] it is not hard to conjecture what was the drift of Fuller's proposal, if the proposed canon was framed by him, or why that proposal is described by Heylyn in such supercilious terms.

The canon, as ultimately adopted by Convocation, is as follows, and we present it to our readers at length, by reason of its special interest at the present time:—

"Because it is generally to be wished that unity of faith were accompanied with uniformity of practice in the outward worship and service of God, chiefly for the avoiding of groundless suspicions of those who are weak, and the malicious aspersions of the professed enemies of our religion, the one fearing the innovations, the other flattering themselves with the vain hope of our backsliding unto their Popish superstition by reason of the situation of the Communion table and the approaches thereunto, the Synod declareth as followeth:—

"That the standing of the Communion table side-way under the east window of every chancel or chapel, is in its own nature indifferent, neither commanded nor condemned by the Word of God,

[d] Fuller's work is entitled "Appeal of Injured Innocence," and was published in 1659.

Digitized by Google

either expressly, or by immediate deduction; and therefore that no religion is to be placed therein, or scruple to be placed thereon. And albeit at the time of reforming this Church from that gross superstition of Popery, it was carefully provided that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people both the inclination thereunto and memory thereof, especially of the idolatry committed in the Mass, for which cause all Popish altars were demolished; yet, notwithstanding, it was then ordered by the Injunctions and Advertisements of Queen *Elizabeth* of blessed memory, that the holy Tables should stand in the place where the altars stood, and accordingly have been continued in the Royal Chapels of three famous and pious Princes, and in most Cathedral and some parochial Churches, which doth sufficiently acquit the manner of placing the said tables from any illegality, or just suspicion of Popish superstition or innovation. And therefore we judge it fit and convenient that all churches and chapels do conform themselves in this particular to the example of the Cathedral or mother Churches, saving always the general liberty left to the Bishop by law during the time of administration of the Holy Communion. And we declare that this situation of the holy Table doth not imply that it is, or ought to be, esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed: but it is and may be called an altar by us, in that sense in which the Primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other.

"And because experience hath showed us how irreverent the behaviour of many people is in many places,—some leaning, others casting their hats, and some sitting upon, some standing, and others sitting under the Communion Table, in time of Divine service; for the avoiding of these and the like abuses, it is thought meet and convenient by this present Synod, that the said Communion Tables in all chancels or chapels be decently severed with rails, to preserve them from such or worse profanations.

"And because the administration of holy things is to be performed with all possible decency and reverence, therefore we judge it fit and convenient (according to the word of the Service-book, established by Act of Parliament, "*Draw near*," etc.) that all communicants, with all humble reverence, shall draw near and approach to the holy Table, there to receive the Divine mysteries, which have heretofore in some places been unfitly carried up and down by the minister, unless it shall be otherwise appointed in respect of the incapacity of the place, or other inconvenience, by the Bishop himself in his jurisdiction, and other Ordinaries respectively in theirs.

"And, lastly, whereas the Church is the house of God, dedicated to His holy worship, and therefore ought to mind us both of the greatness and goodness of His Divine Majesty, certain it is that the acknowledgment thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but also outwardly with our bodies, must needs be pious in itself, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others. We therefore think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obey-

Digitized by Google

sance, both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the Primitive Church in the purest times, and of this Church also for many years of the reign of Queen *Elizabeth*. The reviving therefore of this ancient and laudable custom we heartily commend to the serious consideration of all good people, not with any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the Communion Table, the East, or Church, or any thing therein contained, in so doing, or to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of *Jesus Christ* on the holy Table, or in mystical elements; but only for the advancement of God's majesty, and to give Him alone that honour and glory that is due unto Him, and no otherwise; and in the practice or omission of this rite, we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the Apostle may be observed: which is, that they which use this rite despise not them who use it not; and that they who use it not, condemn not those that use it."

It may fairly be inferred from the terms of this canon, notwithstanding the explicit direction contained in Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559, A.D., that the Holy Table should stand "in the place where the altar stood, *saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed*," and notwithstanding the implied confirmation of that enactment by the eighty-second of the canons of 1604, that this direction respecting the position of the Table, out of the time of the administration of the Holy Communion, had been commonly disobeyed, not only in the majority of the parochial churches, but also in some of the cathedrals.

To the direction itself, it seems difficult to conceive of any valid objection, either on the ground of doctrine or of convenience. As regards convenience, the ordinary arrangement of English churches is such that the Table could not be placed in any position in which it would less interfere with the space available for the use of the congregation; whilst, as regards doctrine, it would appear absolutely impossible that any significance could be attached to the position of *a moveable table* at a time when it was applied to no practical use whatever. It is, indeed, a just cause of regret when, at any time, a matter of perfect indifference in and of itself, proves an occasion of mutual exasperation between contending parties. More particularly is this result to be deplored when the controversy concerns a rite which is emphatically an outward badge of Christian unity,—a table, the conditions of the approach to which is a state of perfect charity with all men. Such was the feeling of Fuller, who quotes, in reference to the needless animosity which the discussion of this subject had aroused, the saying of King James I., in regard to the inverted position of a College chapel at Cambridge: "It

Digitized by Google

matters not how the chapel stands, so the hearts who go thither be set aright in God's service."

But disposed as Fuller was, both by natural disposition and as the result of wide observation and mature conviction, to a course of moderation, and free as he was in a remarkable degree, in consideration of the times in which he lived, from that *odium theologicum* which is too prevalent in all ages, he was too clear-sighted a theologian not to discern, and too sound a Protestant not to bewail, the favourable eye with which Archbishop Laud regarded the proposals for a reconciliation with the Church of Rome, which at this time found favour with some in high places, and which were fraught in the issue with most disastrous results, both to Church and to State. Thus whilst Heylyn records his opinion that, in order to obtain this reconciliation to Rome on advantageous terms, Laud "had all the reason in the world to do as he did," as well in other ecclesiastical matters as, more particularly, "in ordering the Lord's Table to be placed where the altar stood, and making the accustomed reverence in all approaches toward it," Heylyn, on the contrary, clearly discerned the utter impossibility of effecting the reconciliation on any terms which it was practicable for Protestants to accept. It is with direct reference to the course adopted by the Archbishop in this respect, that we find him writing, in his "Church History," as follows:—

"Composition is impossible with such who will not agree except all they sue for, and all the charges of their suit, be to the utmost farthing awarded unto them. Our reconciliation with Rome is clogged with the same impossibilities: she may *be gone to*, but will never *be met with*; such her pride or peevishness, as not to stir a step to obviate any of a different religion. Rome will never so far unpope itself as to part with her pretended supremacy and infallibility, which cuts off all possibility of Protestants treating with her; if possibly, without prejudice to God's glory and the truth, other controversies might be composed: which done, England would have been an island as well in religion as situation, cut off from the continent of foreign Protestant Churches, in a singular position by itself, hard to be imagined, but harder to be effected." *

About the year 1641 Fuller's wife died, and Mr. Bailey says that this bereavement was probably the cause of his removing to London, which he seems to have done at the end of the year. Here he published his work entitled "The Holy State and the Profane State," which alone, of his chief works, is inscribed to no patron. "It presumed," as its author says, "to appear in company unmanned."

"The Holy State" belongs to a class of literature which seems

* "Church History," III., p. 474, 1837.

Digitized by Google

to have gained great popularity in the seventeenth century. Mr. Arber ascribes this popularity to "the growing seriousness of the nation." "In these earlier years of Puritanism especially," he observes, "and generally throughout the seventeenth century, there was a strong passion for analysis of human character: men delighted in introspection; essays and characters took the place of the romances of the former century."[f] Coleridge has left on record his opinion of the work in question, which he declares to be "Alike in quantity, quality and perpetuity, surpassing that of the wittiest in a witty age." When Fuller permanently settled in London he began to preach regularly at the Inns of Court, but in a short time a wider sphere opened to him. He was offered the post of Preacher at the Savoy Chapel, "where his position was," Mr. Bailey says, "probably that of Chaplain." Here Fuller is said to have "most piously and effectually discharged" his duties for about three years, during which time the state of public affairs became more and more disturbed. Three of his sermons preached during this time are still extant, and from them we see how little Fuller was inclined to condone the vices of the party to which his own fortunes afterwards hung. He boldly declared that the hindrances to peace were the many national sins, which belonged not to one army or class of persons. Space fails us to give extracts from these sermons, but we commend them to the attention of those who are anxious to obtain a firm grasp of the principles which determined Fuller's line of action.[g]

In 1643 an order was issued by the Parliament, "imposing an oath not to assist the forces raised by the King without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, upon all persons who were resident in London. Fuller declined to take this oath, and consequently left London and took up his abode at Lincoln College, Oxford. Soon after taking this step he heard that the Parliamentary Sequestrators had transferred his property to other hands. Mr. Bailey says that what affected him most was the wanton dispersion and destruction of part of his library. In this loss he had many fellow-sufferers, among whom was Archbishop Ussher; of whom it is told, that while taking a journey, his papers and books were seized and ruthlessly scattered by some insurgents; but that the neighbours, pitying his loss, from time to time brought to him the dispersed documents, so that at last only a few leaves were missing. Fuller soon became weary of

[f] Earle's "Micro-Cosmography," p. 7.

[g] We have great satisfaction in being able to announce that Mr. Bailey is now engaged in preparing an edition of Fuller's sermons, which have never previously been collected, and which comprise some discoveries of great rarity.

Digitized by Google

his inactive life, and accepted a Chaplaincy in the King's army. Whilst thus engaged, and for many years subsequently, he appears to have kept steadily in view, and to have collected materials for one of his greatest works, entitled "The Worthies of England," the larger portion of which was in print at the time of his death. Army Chaplaincies were then, Mr. Bailey observes, the usual resort of ministers on both sides. Great opportunites of usefulness were doubtless afforded to those who were thus engaged; but among the many sad spectacles which these times presented may surely be reckoned that of beholding men like Fuller and Jeremy Taylor on the one side, arrayed against men such as Howe and Baxter on the other. It may however afford some satisfaction to reflect, that wars in which great principles have been contended for on both sides have ever been marked by corresponding deeds of true heroism; whilst wars like those of the Roses, in which "men, not measures," was the party cry, have been distinguished by a singular lack of earnest moral purpose, and only signalized for the rapacity and violence of those who joined in them.

After some time passed in accompanying Lord Hopton's division of the troops, Fuller settled in the town of Exeter, as Chaplain or Tutor to the infant princess, Henrietta. Here he wrote his "Good Thoughts in Bad Times," which was the first book put forth by him after a long interval of literary inactivity; and here he held a Lectureship, from which he was dismissed by the Parliament in 1646.

He next went to London, where he seems to have devoted himself for a time to literary work. Mr. Bailey says there is nothing to denote how long he remained in London; but shortly afterwards he is found in Northamptonshire, where he met with a kind reception from his former college friend, Edward Montagu, who, being in the confidence of the Parliament, was able to do him good service. Here Fuller remained some time, and it was here that he wrote "Good Thoughts in Worse Times." In 1647 we again find him in London, where he probably entertained some hope that the freedom of the silenced clergy, for which Jeremy Taylor was pleading, would be granted. He was, indeed, shortly afterwards appointed to a Lectureship at St. Clement's, Eastcheap; but he was soon silenced, and henceforth for some time he describes his life as that of a "wandering divine."

In 1648 or 1649 Fuller was presented to the Incumbency of Waltham Abbey, in Essex, by the Earl of Carlisle, who had previously served in the Royal army, but had now deserted it, and attached himself to the opposite party.

The following incident is related as occurring probably during Fuller's residence at Waltham Abbey. When summoned before

Digitized by Google

the Parliamentary Commissioners of Religion (it is not certain whether in Essex or in London), he resolved, before being brought before them, to have an interview with Howe, who was then acting as Cromwell's Chaplain. Howe was a man of spare figure, and Fuller thus accosts him: "Sir, you may observe that I am a pretty corpulent man, and I am to go through a passage that is very strait: I beg you would be so good as to give me a shove, and help me through." When actually brought before the Triers, and asked whether he had ever had "any experience of a work of grace in his heart," Fuller answered, "That he could appeal to the Searcher of hearts, that he made conscience of his very thoughts." We learn that his questioners were quite satisfied with his replies,—"as indeed they well might," adds Calamy.

But we should far exceed our limits were we to attempt to follow Fuller in his varied career at this period of his history, and we must hasten on to the end. His "Church History," which is called by Mr. Bailey "the great literary event" of his life, was published in 1655. He had, probably, formed the design of this work very long before it was actually put into execution, and had been gradually collecting materials. As time went on the position of the sequestered clergy became more and more painful, and no one can refuse to honour the character of Fuller as shown in adversity, when we read that "the grace that was supereminent in the good Doctor was *charity*." It is equally honourable to him that in 1660, when the Royalists were triumphant, and when but too many forgot mercy and toleration in the delights of victory, Fuller urged forgiveness of wrongs on his auditors; and that in his case preaching and practice were not severed is plain, when we read that he refused to allow his successor at Broadwindsor to be ejected, telling the parishioners that from what he had seen and heard of him he could not deprive them of such a man. This act of magnanimity was a fitting close to the life of a man who had so constantly striven not to be carried away in the tide of extreme party feeling. In 1661 Fuller was seized with a disease which is supposed to have been some form of ague, and on the 16th of August he died, "to the irreparable loss and very exceeding sorrow," it is said, "of all men to whom religon, piety, virtue, and supereminent learning were ever acceptable."

It requires but little discernment to foresee that a work comprising very many details hitherto uncollected respecting the life and times of so illustrious a man as Fuller, and embellished with so many interesting portraits and illustrations, is destined to pass through more than one edition. In anticipation of the fulfilment of this augury, we would venture to suggest that the

Digitized by Google

convenience of Mr. Bailey's readers would be greatly consulted if the materials relating to Fuller's kinsmen and associates were either entirely disconnected from those which relate directly to himself, or at least were so arranged as not to break the thread of his personal history. We will only add that we heartily desire, for Mr. Bailey, that success which a work involving so much persevering and laborious investigation, bestowed on so worthy a subject, well deserves.

FOUR YEARS' EXPERIENCE OF DISESTABLISHMENT.

PART II.

In a previous paper we sketched the main features of the legislation of the Irish Church since the time of Disestablishment. In the present article it is proposed to supplement the information there digested by a short statement of the financial operations which have resulted from the passing of the Church Act. And to this something will be added upon the social, and possibly on the theological changes which may be traced to the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland.

(2) *Financial Results.*

During the agitation which preceded the introduction of the Church Bill, and previous to its passing the Upper House on the memorable night of the 26th July, 1869, the most sinister omens were prevalent as to the future. Even her best friends, in their zeal to defend the Establishment, were scarcely complimentary to the Church. Both the solvency and the public spirit of Irish Churchmen were apparently estimated at a very low value. No one seemed to realize that there was either money to be had amongst Churchmen, or brains to organize the best plan of managing it. Even the Lord Primate, than whom no one has been more useful and energetic since the blow fell, seemed to be afflicted with this paralysis of hope. In his Charge, at the Triennial Visitation of his diocese, held in 1868, just at the time when the report of the Established Church Commission of that year was issued, he used these desponding, if not despairing, words:—

"It would be an utter impossibility for the Protestant population, spread over the whole country, to maintain a ministry such as their religion requires, in number in any degree proportioned to their wants. It is idle to suppose it, useless to speak of it. That every exertion would be made, both by clergy and laity, I do not enter-

Digitized by Google

tain a doubt; but a few minutes' contemplation of the area to be provided with ministerial care, the number of inhabitants, and the pecuniary circumstances of the resident people, will convince the most sanguine, *that over the greater part of the island Disendowment means nothing short of extinction.*" [a]

If omens so sinister weighed on the heart of the representative of St. Patrick, and crushed the courage of a Beresford, it is no wonder that the people were in despair. The Church Institution committed itself to the assertion, that "the Disendowment of the Church would practically drive Protestantism from the south, and from many parts of the east and west of Ireland. The Romish Church would supply the void." [b]

The Lord Chancellor of England took an equally desponding view. He had no fear for the large towns, but "apprehended that the thinly sprinkled Protestant population of the wild and agricultural districts of the country would either emigrate, or in time, and that no distant time, be absorbed into the religion of those by whom they are surrounded,—the religion of the Church of Rome." [c]

The Bishop of London took the same tone: "I ask you in the name of the poor Protestants of Ireland that you should not hand them over to Roman Catholicism, and if you disendow and disestablish the Irish Church, you do hand them over." [d]

"The Voluntary System," wrote a well-known Dublin lawyer, and one of the late Ecclesiastical Commissioners, "may support Protestantism where it is already strong, but it will let religion, civilization, and loyalty, die out altogether where it is most important that they should be kept alive." [e]

One of the Masters in the Irish Chancery wrote, in the same ominous year, thus:—

"The theory of reducing the clergy of the Church of England to an equality with the clergy of other sects, is nothing else than the theory of abolishing altogether, in this country (Ireland), the religion and the public worship of this section of the people. Into what other sects these Protestants and their posterity will be distributed, or what new creeds and forms of worship will spring from the ruins of this liberal, enlightened, and tolerant religion, time alone can disclose; but that any such congregations as now assemble in the

---

[a] Charge of 1868, pp. 29—30.

[b] "Church and State, by a Lay Churchman."—Church Institution: London, 1868.

[c] Speech of Lord Cairns in the House of Lords, June 28th, 1868.

[d] Speech at Church and State Meeting, St. James' Hall, May 6th, 1868.

[e] "The Irish Church and Irish Discontent:" Dublin, 1868.

Digitized by Google

Protestant Churches can continue to assemble for any considerable time after the divorce of the Church from the Throne, and the confiscation of its endowments, or that any such ministers as they now reverence can be there to meet them, is morally impossible." [f]

These dark and sinister predictions, which were common on every Protestant platform, and in every Protestant pamphlet, in the year 1868,—have they been verified by the result? Does the experience of the four years which we have under review exhibit a picture of gradual decay, and point to an approaching hour of ecclesiastical extinction? The answer simply depends on the matter of *finance*. There is nothing in Disestablishment itself to turn the people from their Bible, their Prayer-book, their pastor, or their God. Unless Disendowment means the abolition of these, or their removal from contact with the poor, it leaves Protestantism much as it was. Let funds be forthcoming to support the clergy and keep open the churches, and there is no fear in Ireland of any portion of the people forsaking the Church they have been educated to believe the true Catholic Church of Ireland,—in opposition to the claims of the Popish Church, introduced in the 16th century as a rival to the reformed.[g]

The financial history of the Disestablished Church, if written in detail, would occupy far more space than we can devote to it. But even in a brief summary sufficient evidence will be presented of the injustice of the anticipations already referred to. The nursery saying, that "you don't know what you can do till you try," has met with a new illustration in the financial re-organization of the Church. The Diocesan Reports of 1871-2-3 of all the dioceses in Ireland, with scarcely an exception, furnish our information, which is thus throughout derived from original sources. The reports for 1874, which have been issued since this paper was written, speak in encouraging terms in most cases of the Church's prospects.

In the earlier days of separation between Church and State in Ireland the vaguest proposals were suggested from all quarters with regard to the best method of sustentation. It was not for above a year, or a year and a half, that a system of finance, secure and at the same time neither costly nor hard to carry on, crystallized into a definite shape. The two extremes between which the pendulum of public favour oscillated at first were

---

[f] "Ireland in 1868," by G. Fitzgibbon, Master in Chancery, p. 30.

[g] On the Introduction of an alien Episcopate into Ireland in 16th century, see Bishop Wordsworth's "Sermons on the Church of Ireland," p. 227. King's "History," pp. 889—914. Wordsworth: "The Church of Ireland," small edition, p. 51. Rivingtons.

Digitized by Google

those of parochial or congregational independence and of general or national sustentation. In the first the parish was to manage itself, in the second all payments were to be made out of a common purse. There are still a few who believe in one or the other of these modes of sustentation, but the majority soon realized that there were objections on the score of principle, and also of possibility, against both one and the other.[h]

Against the plan of congregational independence it was justly urged that while it would work well where the congregations were numerous and wealthy, it would be totally impracticable in three-fourths of Ireland. To this source, therefore, the Church soon learned to look only for Church requisites, and in suitable cases for an augmentation to the clerical income.

On the other hand the attractive theory of one general fund, —one common purse into which everyone should drop his mite, and upon which everyone would have a claim,—was found to be too abstract to work well. It removed the fund too far from everyone's door, and appealed too little to local interests to succeed. This plan, however, was officially propounded by the General Convention in 1870. Eleven resolutions on the subject of the Sustentation Fund of the whole Church were circulated (pp. 65—67, "Statutes of Convention"). The Convention requested the Prelates to issue a pastoral to be read in all Churches, asking for a donation from every member of the Church, and a promise of an annual subscription, which, with the interest of the donations, would form a sufficient annual income for the Church.

The response to this appeal was fair, but not remarkable.

---

[h] One of the best qualified financiers of Belfast, a well-known banker, put forward, in 1869, a system of sustentation, which at the time attracted favourable attention, but which is now interesting chiefly from its total dissimilarity to that finally adopted. Calculating 16¼ years as the average expectancy of life among the then existing clergy, and proposing to invest at compound interest all the funds available for that period, Mr. Wm. Valentine showed that at the end of 16¼ years the Church might be expected to possess the following re-endowment:—

		£
1.	Surplus from the Commutation Fund, after paying all annuities	500,000
2.	Surplus from the Private Endowment Fund of half a million, at compound interest	625,000
3.	Income from pew rents, centralized	1,074,000
4.	Contributions from the Laity	520,000
5.	Contributions from the Clergy (!)	335,000
6.	Life Insurances on Clergy	500,000
7.	Periodical Collections in Churches	255,000
		£3,809,000

This plan certainly did not lean heavily on the laity, and depended largely on pew rents, all of which were to be paid into a central fund, thus leaving little for local support of church fabrics or officials.

Digitized by Google

The Representative Body of the Church published a list the next year of the amounts received, the larger portion of which were donations, and went to capital account. The amount in 1870 was £229,753. Of this, forty-seven individuals contributed £105,000,[1] leaving £124,753 as the result of this first year's grand effort. (The amount the next year was less by £15,000.) The Church population of Ireland being, in 1871, 683,295, the amount contributed to the general fund in the first year may be set down, when the donations of the forty-seven above named are omitted, at about 3s. 7d. a head. The result was little in comparison either to what was required or expected, and it soon pressed itself on the convictions of Churchmen that some plan more directly appealing to the interests of each locality, while avoiding the evils of mere congregationalism, must be sought for and adopted generally.

That plan was elaborated by the Representative Body during the following year; and being, so far as can be ascertained, quite satisfactory in the large majority of cases, is likely to be the permanent plan of endowment for the future. Under the title of "*Diocesan Financial Schemes*," the happy mean between parochial independence and national combination is attained. The unit of action being the diocese, the interests of each locality are not lost sight of, while the strong can help the weak in every diocese.

Diocesan schemes postulate the commutation of the clerical annuities, and proceed on the theory that a certain diocesan payment every year will make the capital arising from commutation last for ever. A word is necessary on the subject of commutation in order to make this matter clear.

The clergy of the Irish Church were permitted, but not required, to commute their annuities for a capital sum to be paid to the Representative Church Body charged with the annuity so long as the annuitant lived, or, discharging his clerical office, required the payment to be continued. But although the clergy were not *obliged* to commute, and though in the opinion of some, there was hazard in exchanging Government security for that of the fund arising from commutation, which, it was said, might by mismanagement not hold out long enough,—yet strong and

[1] The £105,000 was contributed thus: one gift of £20,000 was given by an English nobleman; two of £12,000 each were from two Dublin merchant princes; one of £6,000 was from a northern Earl; one of £5,000 from a southern Bishop; one of £3,000 from a private gentleman; six of £2,000 each from various Irish and English donors; and thirty-five of £1,000 each from others. Total: £105,000. All these go to capital. The interest at 4% of the donations, etc., of 1870, amounts to £9,190. It will be shown that one year's *subscriptions*, which go to income, under the system finally adopted, amounts to nearly *twelve* times that amount.

Digitized by Google

effectual pressure was put upon the clergy. The Church at large would be gainer by general commutation in two ways. First, a capital fund would be received which might be so invested as to yield a surplus after paying annuities, and which could be manipulated ingeniously so as to form, with the aid of subscriptions, a sort of partial re-endowment for the Church; and secondly, in any diocese in which three-fourths of the clergy commuted, an addition of 12 per cent. (23 sec., Ch. Act) to the commutation capital would be paid to the Church body, and this 12 per cent. would far more than pay the cost of management.

It was soon perceived that there was a possibility of saving to the Church all or nearly all the capital which represented the annuities. Let the laity subscribe annually the difference between the interest obtained on the fund, and the annuities chargeable on it, and it would not be gradually eaten away by the payment of annuities, but would remain so long as the subsidiary payments compensated for the decay resulting from paying the annuities.

Further inducements to commute were held out to the clergy, both by Government and by the "Church Body" in Stephen's Green. By the former the clergy were promised the immediate payment of all building charges on their glebes, which in the ordinary course of affairs were only recoverable from their successors in the incumbencies; by the latter the clergy were tempted in a three-fold manner: first, the Representative Body promised quarterly payments instead of the half-yearly gales of the Commissioners; second, they offered *loans* to the annuitants, under a system now well known in the Irish Church as "Table 3," whereby a portion of the capital was paid to the clergyman on his relinquishing a corresponding portion of his annuity, depending on his age. Up to the 31st December, 1872, 565 transactions under Table 3, had taken place, whereby £75,000 of annuities were extinguished by the advance to the clergy of a capital sum of £844,000; third, the Representative Body offered the liberty of composition of the whole annuity to such commuting clergy as desired it. By this system all mutual liabilities whatever were said to be removed between the clergyman and the Church Body. It is, however, but just to add that some dissatisfaction arose in the working of composition, by the fact that the diocesan schemes taxed the compounding clergy on admitting them to benefices, although they had compounded on the understanding that all liabilities on both sides had ceased when the transaction was completed.[1]

[1] Since these words were written, the letters of Mr. Bence Jones in the *Times* and *Guardian* newspapers have placed the clergy of the Irish Church before the world in the most unfavourable light possible. The refutation of Mr. Jones's

Digitized by Google

Up to December 31st, 1873, 736 cases of composition had taken place, £968,500 had been paid to individuals, and £1,006,000 had been held for the Church, and £148,500 of annuities had been extinguished.

Such were the three benefits offered to the clergy, to induce them to commute. The clergy at first suspected the security, and many were unwilling to exchange Government security for that of a new and untried Body; but they were coaxed by every imaginable method, and as it could not be doubted that the transaction appeared perfectly safe, a beginning was made, others followed, and soon commutation became general. Up to December 31st, 1873, 2058 out of the 2160 clergy of the late Establishment had commuted. Only 102 held aloof, or were prevented by death from carrying out their intention: twenty-six fall under the last category.[k]

Such was the foundation of Diocesan schemes: the saving of capital by supplementing the interest was the theory carried out generally. It was presented to the parishes in this simple form: "If you pay annually, from 1871, to the Diocesan treasurer a yearly assessment of £——, you will receive for your *next* incumbent, so long as your payment continues, £——: nearly double what you subscribe." To take an example from the diocese of Down. All parishes are allotted incomes under the scheme, of from £150 to £300 for future incumbents. To secure £150 a parish must commence with 1871, and pay £80 a year; for £200 it must pay £110; for £250 its assessment is £140; for £300 it is £170. The difference between this assessment and the future income is made up by the diocese out of interest of capital saved, and interest of subscriptions during the interval between the time when the parish begins to contribute, and the time when it becomes chargeable by the avoidance of the benefice on the Diocesan funds.

This plan of support has been, with minor modifications, carried

---

arguments has been readily accomplished in both these newspapers by Rev. M. Jellett and others, by a simple exhibition of facts. Here we shall only add that Mr. Jones always condemns the "Irish Clergy"—2000 in number—for conduct which, on his own showing, only one-third were guilty of; and further, that in the majority of cases the clergyman only compounded because he was obliged to do so by the Representative Body.

[k] *Safety of commutation.* The total capital arising from commutation amounted at the close of 1872 to £5,451,222; from which, deducting the balance left by composition, there remains a fund bearing interest at £4 7s. 9d. per cent., of £4,658,221 charged with annuities amounting to £330,626. This fund, even at four per cent., would be sufficient to pay the annuities, supposing the average age of the clergy to be forty-four, which is considerably below—say six per cent.—the average. It would thus appear that the clergy have not accepted a rotten security in exchanging their paymasters, and it is to them in their straitened means an undoubted boon to be paid quarterly.

Digitized by Google

out in every diocese in Ireland. Of this plan the Report of the Representative Body says, "While the Representative Body is not responsible for the management of these schemes, due care has been taken to see that the principles on which they have been established were financially sound. In every case, before the consent of the Representative Body was given, the scheme was considered in detail by the Commutation Committee, with the assistance of their actuary, Mr. W. J. Hancock, F.S.A."

It will readily be seen that the future of the Church, in its financial aspect, depends greatly upon,—first, the adoption of this plan by the large majority of parishes in all the dioceses; and second, the regular and continual payment by the parishes of their assessments. Without this latter the capital must be eaten into, or the parishes in default be cut adrift. We have carefully compiled the following table, showing the present position of the Diocesan Scheme from the reports of all the dioceses, which have been furnished by the kindness of the various secretaries. We may, however, premise that absolute accuracy is not attainable, on account of the fact that arrears are continually being paid up. The table shows the apparent state of the dioceses at close of 1872. For errors in detail we apologize, by anticipation, to those concerned.

This table was compiled before the issue of reports for 1874. We are happy to find that the total contributed under the Schemes in 1873 was £124,406, as against £106,700 (apparently) in 1872.

Under the Schemes 1,226 incumbents and 234 curates are proposed to be maintained, as against 1,459 incumbents and 921 curates before 1871, showing a reduction in the clerical staff of 920 clergymen. The number of parishes it is proposed to reduce from 1583 to 1228. The amount of stipends proposed to be paid is £248,479, to provide which, under the Schemes, a sum of £142,497 must annually be paid.

The arrears in the table given are a matter to be very seriously considered. In order to save the Church from degenerating into a mere congregational or independent system, the dioceses must maintain their unity, and the strong must help the weak. The success of the Financial Schemes will ensure this grand result: their failure will break up the Church into a multitude of fragments, some of which will speedily be annihilated. The arrears of assessments in the year 1872, appear to be about £15,000. In 1873 it amounts to £18,090. In the opinion of many able to judge of the ability of the Irish people to contribute, the parishes in most of the dioceses are well able to pay the amounts at which they are assessed, while in the west,—in Tuam and Killaloe,—they are not. The only appeal *ad misericordiam*

Digitized by Google

Table showing (approximately) the Working of the Diocesan Schemes in the Irish Church (1873).

Name of Diocese.	No. of Parishes to be kept up.	No. of Parishes joining the Scheme.	No. now chargeable on Scheme.	No. in arrears in 1872 or 3.	Amount of Arrears in Assessment.	Contributions under Scheme, 1872.	Observations.
Province of Armagh.					£	£	
Armagh	90	66	29	36	1,055	7,676	The diocese has credit for a considerable sum with Rep. Body.
Clogher	73	40	39		515	2,780	
Derry and Raphoe	110	107	39	3	24	19,355	Flourishing.
Down and Connor	162	116	49	19	1,307	12,000	Satisfactory.
Kilmore	48	43	21 ?	23	1,524	5,385	
Elphin	27						
Ardagh	28						
Tuam	39	39	17	23	2,087	2,644	Improving in financial results.
Killala, etc.	23						
Meath	79	61	29		4,563	5,988	
Province of Dublin.							
Cashel, Emly, etc.	34	28 ?	15	16	1,334	3,929	1871.
Cork, Cloyne, and Ross	96		37			12,497	Very flourishing.
Dublin, Glendalogh, and Kildare	163	67	14			15,418	Nearly all paid.
Killaloe, etc., East	25		9	10 ?	200	3,107	Five or six parishes vacant.
,, West	23			16		3,791	Partly *capital.*
Limerick	38	29	16			2,904	Apparently no arrears.
Ardfert	41						
Aghadoe							
Ossory	50 ?	33			1,320	3,888	
Ferns	47			15	658	5,373	Half of two years' payments.
Leighlin	30						

This table is not put forth as absolutely accurate. The variety of plans in keeping diocesan accounts renders it difficult to arrive at perfectly exact results for inter-diocesan comparison.

Digitized by Google

which is necessary, is for contributions from England to the credit of these two dioceses, and especially of the western division of Killaloe, where 4,000 Church people, most of them very poor, are scattered over the moors and mountains of the county Clare, and are unable to maintain a resident ministry for themselves. Three or four thousand pounds lodged to the credit of that diocese (Killaloe, west) would make an important difference in the prospects of the Church there.[1]

With these exceptions there can be no doubt that the Irish Church has nobly righted herself after the squall which burst on her five years ago, and if she is not yet in *full sail*, her spars are rapidly spreading their canvas to the favouring wind. There are however no "prizes" in the Church left. Very few livings of above £300 a year are even proposed, and some of these proposed at £350 to £400 will be found incapable of realization. An average maximum of £200, or at most £250, may be looked forward to by the larger proportion of the aspirants after honour in the clerical profession in that country.

THE GREVILLE MEMOIRS.

The Greville Memoirs. A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV. and King William IV. By the late Charles C. F. Greville, Esq., Clerk of the Council to those Sovereigns. Edited by Henry Reeve, Registrar of the Privy Council. In three volumes. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1874.

It is probable that many of our readers have, like ourselves, conjectured whether any person now living is preparing for those who come after us such lively pictures of the men and manners of our own times as we ourselves delight to read in the letters and journals of those who mixed in the society and shared the confidence of the leading men of former generations. Memoirs of their own times, and vindications of their own lives and actions, are as likely to be written by living and future statesmen as by those who have gone before. Burnet's History of his own Times and "The Life of the Earl of Clarendon" are represented in our times by the "Autobiography of Sir Robert Peel," already given to the public, and by the Memoirs of Lord Dalhousie, and of Talleyrand, which are known

[1] Since the text was written several allotments of money have been made to the credit of the western dioceses, both from English donations and the Irish Church Representative Body; but the appeal above is still a pressing one.

Digitized by Google

to exist; and the same motives which prompted these records will doubtless influence the statesmen of future times. But will such works as Swift's "Journal to Stella" and "The Letters of Horace Walpole to Sir Horace Man," in our own country, and the "Letters of Sevigné" and "Correspondence of Baron Grim," in a neighbouring one, find a counterpart in the present day? Is any one preparing to make the statesmen and wits of the reign of Queen Victoria as well known to our grandchildren as those of the Courts of Queen Anne and Louis XIV., of the Regency of the Duke of Orleans and the days of the Georges, have been made to us by those and kindred works? Two circumstances appear to be adverse to this supposition. In the first place, the fulness and accuracy with which all events are chronicled by the press has rendered accessible to all alike the information which was formerly the privilege of a few, and which it was, therefore, as delightful to communicate as to receive. Instead of the details which swelled the letters of former days, a few comments on events, taken as known equally by both parties, are all that is to be found in the generality of modern letters. And in the second place, this change has been further influenced by the cheapness of postage. When half-a-crown or five shillings had to be paid for a letter, it was necessary that an effort should be made to render welcome so costly an offering, and quantity as well as quality was deemed a requisite ingredient. The art of pleasant letter writing was, therefore, more cultivated than at present. The change in the form of correspondence within the memory of those still living is consequently so marked, that a letter of their own early days, on its large sheet, with every page crossed, and a few last lines written round the seal, is a curiosity even to those of their children who have already reached manhood.

These circumstances will, we believe, render the correspondence of the present day far less interesting to those who come after us than that of our predecessors has been to ourselves. "Lives and letters" will probably be less numerous, and certainly less voluminous, than they have been heretofore, and posterity will probably look in vain for another Horace Walpole.

But we may still hope that the art of journalizing will be but little affected by the change, and that from time to time there will spring up one possessed of the peculiar qualifications and opportunities enjoyed by the author of the volumes now before us, which render his work as interesting as it is historically valuable.

Such qualifications and such opportunities as the author of the Greville Journal possessed are rarely combined. Those endowed with the talents necessary to form a shrewd judgment on passing

Digitized by Google

events, and on the motives and characters of the leading actors, are generally themselves drawn into active life, and become subject to all the one-sided influences of party politics. While those who move on the surface of society, mingling alike with persons of all parties, are not often possessed of the shrewd intellect and the literary powers possessed by Mr. Greville, which induced statesmen of all shades of politics to converse with him freely, and often to seek his opinion, and enabled him to sketch with a vigorous pen the portraits of those who thus came under his view. Endowed with many of the qualifications which go to form a great statesman, and born in a rank of life which would appear to point to politics as his natural career, circumstances placed him in a position which brought him into intimate connection with all the leading men of the day, from the Sovereign downwards, but necessarily confined his own part to that of a spectator, rather than an actor, in the drama of his times. Though himself decidedly of the liberal politics of the family to which he belonged, he was uncompromised by allegiance to any party or chief, and could shrewdly detect, and has unsparingly recorded, the errors which had their rise in private interest or party manœuvre on either side. One day riding for an hour and a half in the park with Earl Grey, and another closeted for a couple of hours with the Duke of Wellington; one day listening to the Duke's outspoken opinion of Canning, another to Lord Lyndhurst's account of his acceptance of the Great Seal, and "of the speculation it was," when "political opinions and political consistency seemed never to occur to him, and he considered the matter in a light so business-like and professional as to be quite amusing;" another day enjoying all the charms of Brougham's social powers, while marking with a keen eye all his vanities and eccentricities, the writer has left a series of sketches of men of all parties, which bear upon them the stamp of truth and fidelity. Seldom professing or attempting to draw the characters of any of the parties, he has left the materials from which their characters may be drawn. Recording from time to time the impressions of the moment, leaving those of one day as first recorded though modified or even contradicted by the impression of another, or by the issue of events, he has placed before the reader a series of materials from which he is left to draw his own conclusions with more of the feelings of a personal knowledge of the actors than is conveyed by any other book that we are acquainted with.

As the value of a work of this nature is peculiarly dependent on the opinion we form of the character of the author, we shall endeavour to show what judgment the writer has led us to form of himself, before we consider what weight is to be given to

Digitized by Google

the judgments passed by him on the characters and actions and motives of his contemporaries.

Charles Greville was, on the mother's side, the grandson of the third Duke of Portland. His father, Charles Greville, was grandson of the fifth Earl of Warwick. He was born on the 2nd April, 1794, and was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. From his mother he appears to have inherited a taste for literature, and he was evidently endowed with powers for the exercise of which his grandfather's influence must have ensured him an ample field. But unhappily the kindness of his influential relatives was exerted in a way which had, as he always considered, a disastrous influence on his whole life. Through the Duke's interest he obtained in early life the sinecure appointment of the Secretaryship of Jamaica,—the duties being performed by deputy,—and likewise the reversion of the Clerkship of the Council. Upon the latter he did not enter till 1821, and as we are not told what was the value of the Secretaryship, we are unable to form an opinion of the means at his disposal; but it would appear that while they were sufficient to deter him from entering on any profession, they did not meet the requirements, real or supposed, of his social position. At the age of eighteen he was appointed private Secretary to the Earl of Bathurst, and thus an opening would appear to have been made to political diplomatic life. But by the mistaken kindness, or neglect of his patron, this opportunity was converted into the serious disaster of his life: left to follow his own course, without a kind word of advice or guidance, he was led to follow a taste for the turf, and gradually came to look upon it as a profession by which his income was to be raised to the proportion of his wants. Thus a man of high honour, and conscious of powers for better things, found himself in mature life hanging on society as a sinecurist and a gambler. It is no small proof of the force of the character thus marred, that he should have maintained through life a sensitive love of truth and honour, under circumstances so unfavourable.

It may seem that we apply a harsh term to the pursuits of a young member of the aristocracy following a taste for horse-racing; but with Charles Greville it became a profession, followed for the sake of gain, and one of which he felt all the degradation,—the degradation of high powers devoted to unworthy and demoralizing purposes. In 1819, at the age of twenty-five, he writes:—

"I have been at Oatlands for the Ascot party. On the course I did nothing. Ever since the Derby, ill-fortune has pursued me, and I cannot win anywhere. Play is a detestable occupation: it absorbs all our thoughts and renders us unfit for anything else in

Digitized by Google

life; it is hurtful to the mind and destroys the better feelings; it incapacitates us for application and study of any sort; it makes us thoughtful and nervous, and our cheerfulness depends upon the uncertain event of our nightly occupation. How anyone can play who is not in want of money I cannot comprehend: surely his mind must be strangely framed who requires the stimulus of gambling to heighten his pleasures. . . . . Why does a man play who is blessed with fortune, endowed with understanding, and adorned with accomplishments which might insure his success in any pursuit which taste or fancy might incite him to follow? It is contrary to reason, but we see such instances every day." [a]

Strange that such a mind should not have seen that the very fact of following the pursuit for gain,—that is, to live by the losses of other men,—was more morally degrading even than a habit resulting from a love of excitement or from the craving after activity of an unemployed mind. In later life (at the age of nearly forty) the same feeling is expressed with deepening intensity.

"Nothing but the hope of gain," he writes, in 1833, "would induce me to go through this demoralizing drudgery, which I am conscious reduces me to the level of all that is most disreputable and despicable, for my thoughts are eternally absorbed by it. Jockeys, trainers, and blacklegs are my companions." [b]

In the year 1834, on the occasion of the death of the Earl of Bathurst, he recalls with deep regret his unfortunate start in life, and speaks with something of bitterness of his patron.

"I was Lord Bathurst's private Secretary for several years; but so far from feeling any obligation to him I always consider his mistaken kindness in giving me that post as the source of all my misfortune and the cause of my present condition. He never thought fit to employ me, never associated me with the interests and the business of his office, and consequently abandoned me at the age of eighteen to that life of idleness and dissipation from which I might have been saved had he felt that my future prospects in life, my character and talents, depended in great measure upon the direction that was at that moment given to my mind. He would probably have made me a Tory (which I should hardly have remained); but I should have become a man of business, and of the antagonist tastes that divided my mind, that for literature and employment would have got the better of that for amusement and idleness, instead, as unfortunately happened, of the latter prevailing over the former." [c]

But once embarked in this career, the very talents and quali-

---

[a] Vol. i., p. 20. [b] Vol. ii., p. 374.
[c] Vol. iii., p. 116. 1834.

Digitized by Google

fications which he brought to bear upon his adopted pursuit seemed to rivet the chain around him. In 1821 the Duke of York proposed to him to take the management of his horses; and as "nothing could be more kind than the manner in which he proposed it," the office was accepted "as the realization of one of the things he had most desired in the world for years past," and he remained in charge till the time of the Duke's death. His position and his personal character soon ensured Charles Greville a high standing in the racing world. Anything that such a man applied his powers to was sure to be done with energy, and with as much of high-mindedness as is compatible with such associations. His authority on the turf was great, and seldom disputed. "No man, ever so high or low, we believe," wrote an ardent admirer after his death, "ever sought his advice and assistance in vain; and to no one individual, probably, have so many and such various difficulties been submitted. Neither can we remember a new trial, or even an appeal demanded by those who had sought his counsel." "Beloved by his friends and feared by his opponents, Mr. Greville," it was added, "will ever be considered one of the most remarkable men that have lent lustre to the English turf."

But how galling the chain was is told in many passages of painful interest. In 1834, at the age of forty, he writes:—

"My campaign on the turf has been a successful one. Still all this success has not prevented frequent disgusts; and I derive anything but unmixed pleasure from this pursuit, even when I win by it. Besides the continual disappointments and difficulties incident to it which harass the mind, the life it compels me to lead, the intimacies arising out of it, the associates, and the war against villany and trickery, being haunted by continual suspicions, discovering the trust-*un*worthiness of one's most intimate friends, the necessity of insincerity and concealment sometimes where one feels that one ought and would desire to be most open; then the degrading nature of the occupation, mixing with the lowest of mankind, and absorbed in the business for the sole purpose of getting money, the consciousness of a sort of degradation of intellect, the convictions of the deteriorating effects upon both the feelings and the understanding which are produced, the sort of dram-drinking excitement of it,—all these things and these thoughts torment me, and often turn my pleasure into pain."[d]

Similar passages abound throughout these volumes, showing how uneasy is the yoke, and how heavy the burden of the world, even to its most favoured votaries and among companions supposed to be congenial. But when he came in contact with

[d] Vol. iii., p. 139-40.

Digitized by Google

minds devoted to higher, if not to the highest objects worthy of intellectual and immortal beings, the self-upbraidings of a noble mind were painfully severe.

"When I read such books as 'Macintosh's Life,' and see what other men have done,—how they have read and thought,—a sort of despair comes over me,—a deep sensation of regret 'for time misspent and talents misapplied.' . . . . The most galling of all positions is that of him whose conscience and consciousness whisper to him perpetual reproaches,—who feels what he might have been, and who feels and sees what he is. When such a man as Macintosh, fraught with all learning,—whose mind if not kindled into a steady blaze, is perpetually throwing out sparks and coruscations of exceeding brightness,—is striving with these self-upbraidings, what must be the reflection of those the utmost reach of whose industry is far below the value of his most self-accused idleness; who have no self-consolation; are plunged in entire darkness; and have not only to lament the years of omission, but those of commission; not only the opportunities neglected, but the positive mischief done by the debasement of the faculties, the deterioration of the understanding, the impairing of the power of exertion consequent on a long devotion to low, desperate, unprofitable habits and pursuits." [e]

"Reflections of this sort," he writes on another occasion, "make me very uncomfortable; and I am ready to cry with vexation when I think of my misspent life." [f]

But amidst these disgusts there was still much to bind Mr. Greville to the course upon which he had embarked. His position in society in virtue of his high birth, and his position in the racing world, brought him into connection with the leading members of society; and ultimately his office of Clerk of the Council placed him in intimate intercourse with political men of both parties. And there must have been something very striking in the character of the man to whom the leaders on both sides unbosomed themselves so freely. That his judgment was highly appreciated by all with whom he came into connection is manifest throughout these volumes. There were pleasures and satisfactions in this; but to an honourable mind and a clear judgment there was another source of dissatisfaction. As he hung on society as a gambler, so he hung on the political world as a sinecurist.

When reform was busy in sweeping away the abuses of the corrupt system of past ages, Mr. Greville's salary as Secretary of Jamaica became the subject of attack in the House of Commons. The circumstances accompanying the debates which ensued were gratifying, as proving the number of his friends and

[e] Vol. iii., p. 293. [f] Vol. iii. p. 128.

Digitized by Google

well-wishers, but mortifying in showing to himself that he held a position which his own sense of right could hardly approve, and that he was canvassing others to support what his own judgment could hardly justify.

"I can't deny," he writes, "that many persons have shown a very kind disposition to assist me in this business of my Jamaica place, of different political persuasions, and with most of whom I have but a very slight personal acquaintance; among them none more than Mr. Gladstone and Lord Lincoln, neither of whom did I know to speak to till I put myself into communication with them on this business. On the other hand, Charles Wood (Lord Halifax), who is against me in his opinion, has been the channel of communication with Baring (who had moved the resolution in the House), and shown generally a good will towards me. These demonstrations are agreeable enough, and contribute to put one in harmony with mankind: but it is after all a humiliating position; and I feel unutterable disgust, and something akin to shame, at being compelled to solicit the protection of one set of men, and the friendly offices of another, in order to be kept in the possession of that which is in itself obnoxious to public feeling and opinion. A placeman is in these days an odious animal; and as a double placeman I am doubly odious; and I have a secret kind of whispering sensation that these very people who good-naturedly enough assist me, must be a little shocked at the cause they advocate. All that can be said in my favour is not obvious, nor can it be properly or conveniently brought forward; and all that can be said against it lies on the surface, and is universally evident. The funds from which I draw my means do not somehow seem a pure source: formerly those things were tolerated, now they are not; and my prospects were formed and destiny determined at a remote period, while I incur all the odium and encounter all the risks consequent on the altered state of feeling on the subject." [s]

Through the zeal of friends who could adopt his cause, and the reluctance of others to give an adverse vote, after "an angry debate of three hours' duration," the cause was won, and "Graham and Lincoln came in with smiling countenances that announced good news." "The good will of the world" (a very inert but rather satisfactory feeling), he writes, "has been exhibited towards me;" but there was a bitterness in the feeling that "he owed the victory to the Conservatives, for not one Whig or Radical voted with him," and that those who voted and those who abstained from voting were actuated by motives personal to himself, rather than by a feeling of right.

There are many indications throughout these pages that had the powers of Charles Greville been devoted to higher duties

[s] Vol. iii. p. 275.

Digitized by Google

they would have been discharged with the same energy and success as were brought to bear upon the ignoble pursuits in which he so unhappily became involved. Of this some proof was afforded when the alarm of the approach of the cholera called for vigorous measures on the part of the Privy Council; and he, as their clerk, was called to take an active part in organizing the means of protection. He entered upon the task with vigour: his inquiries on the subject revealed to him something of the privations and sufferings of the masses, and he learnt that there was a state of things worthy of the attention of men, of which "we," as he expresses it, "who float on the surface of society, know but little." The impression was evidently a deep one. And there are many passages in the book which show that there was one class of mind with which Charles Greville had no sympathy, and that is a mind that was not in earnest.

A remarkable conversation which he records himself to have held with Sir James Graham, affords a striking instance in illustration of the last observation. It occurred at the time when Sir James Graham and Lord Stanley were closely associated through their severance from their Whig colleagues on the question of the celebrated "Appropriation Clause" of the Irish Church Bill. Relating an interview with Sir James, he writes:

"He talked of Stanley with great openness,—of his talents, character and political views..... He asked in what way Stanley had offended. I told him generally in the sarcastic or reprobating tone he had used, and particularly in his personal attack on the Duke for holding the offices. He vowed there was truth in this, but what could you do? It was impossible to change a character, and Stanley's was very peculiar. With great talents and extraordinary readiness in debate, high principles, unblemished honour, he never had looked, he thought he never would look, upon politics and political life with the seriousness that belonged to the subject; he followed politics as an amusement, as a means of excitement, as another would gaming or any other very excitable occupation; he plunged into the *melée* for the sake of the sport which he found it made him, but always actuated by honourable and consistent principles and feelings; and though making it a matter of amusement and diversion, never sacrificing anything that honour or conscience prescribed. I said that this description of him (which I had no doubt was true) only proved what I already thought,—'that with all his talents he never would be a great man.' He said, 'He always must be very considerable; his powers, integrity, birth and fortune could not fail to raise him to eminence.' All this I admitted; that nothing could prevent his being very considerable, very important, as a public man; but I argued that one who was animated by motives so personal, so wanting in gravity, to whom

Digitized by Google

public care was a subsidiary and not a primary object, never could achieve permanent and genuine greatness." [h]

We have said that the author was able to hold the balance fairly between the two parties, and the following passages will show that he could pass severe judgments on both, and that he found a high standard of the true dignity of statesmanship. Of the conduct of the Whig party in 1835, he writes:

"Feb. 23rd. The Opposition wish to move an amendment to the address, which they expect to carry by a larger majority than the last. The tactics are completely arranged, and their understanding with O'Connell and all the Radicals so good that they think there is no danger of any indiscreet ebullition in any quarter. Discarding every prospective consideration and prepared to encounter all consequences, they concentrate all their energies upon the single object of turning out the Government, in which they have no doubt of succeeding. It is the first time, as far as I know, that any great party ever proceeded upon and avowed such a principle as that which binds these people together and puts them in action; namely, to destroy the King's Ministry without any reference to the measures that Ministry may propose, and without waiting to see how they intend to carry on the Government. Not only do they throw out of their consideration the conduct of the administration, but they are resolved to accomplish its destruction without being prepared to substitute any stronger Government in its room, and with a perfect knowledge that its dissolution must necessarily produce a state of extraordinary embarrassment, from which they do not profess to have the power of extricating the country." [i]

In the following passage censure is fairly meted out to both parties for obstructions thrown in the way of legislation by measures adopted for party purposes; the Whigs for endangering the Irish Church Bill, and risking a collision with the House of Lords by insisting on the appropriation clause, a purely hypothetical case, intended to win O'Connell and the radicals; the Tories for equally factious opposition to Corporate Reform:

"It is remarkable, and rather amusing to a neutral like me, to hear what each party says of the other. I saw in the *Examiner* this day that 'the Lords cannot now pass the Bill if they would, without disgracing their party in the House of Commons,' and Wharncliffe said that 'the Government could not give up the appropriation clause in the Tithe Bill without covering themselves with disgrace.' In my opinion the disgrace is not in making concessions which reason and expediency demand, and which are indispensable to the peace and tranquility of the country, but in ever having pledged themselves to measures for party purposes, or to accomplish par-

[h] Vol. 3, p. 249.

[i] Vol. 3, p. 217.

Digitized by Google

ticular ends, without calculating the consequences of such measures, or estimating the degree of power they would possess of giving effect to the principles they avowed. This applies more strongly a great deal to the Whigs about the Tithe Bill than to the Tories about the Corporations; but it does apply to both, and it is a national misfortune when two great parties so commit themselves that no adjustment of the question between them is possible without some detriment to the credit and character of both." [1]

In another passage he writes:—

"With regard to their (the Whigs) taking the Bill without the clause, they, and Lord John in particular, must make up their minds, if they do so, to have every species of abuse poured upon them from their Tory enemies and their Radical friends; but they are in a scrape, and had in fact got the country into a scrape too, and their duty now was to take that course which on the whole seemed to produce the best results, whatever it might personally cost them, and to whatever reproaches they might render themselves liable."

We have thus endeavoured to express the impressions which we have formed of the writer from the indications which lie scattered throughout these volumes, and the conclusion we draw is, that this interesting and fascinating book not only comes to us from one who had unusual opportunities of observation, but that all that is there set down may be thoroughly relied upon as the impression conveyed to an acute mind, and is recorded with all the accuracy that a retentive memory and a love of fairness could ensure. The very habits of life, so unfavourable to the writer's own prospects, were favourable to the production of such a work as this. A habit of studying character and analyzing motives fostered on the race-course and in the betting-club, was brought to bear upon those engaged in the struggles and contests of politics; the habit of acting as arbitrator in the disputes of the turf imparted a skill in weighing words and actions in equal scales, while intercourse with persons of all classes of society, and of all shades of politics, appears to have imparted a manner which invited friendship and encouraged confidence.

We are far from saying that there may not be many mistaken judgments, or that a work of this kind is to be thoroughly relied upon, or that it would be fair to take any of the judgments as final. All we say is, that we have a sketch, or rather many sketches, of each of the eminent characters of the times, as they presented themselves at the moment to a skilful, and generally impartial, observer. And in considering a work of this kind,

[1] Vol. iii., p. 390.

Digitized by Google

which professes only to give the impressions of the moment, and leaves them to be confirmed or modified by after experience, it is essential to remember that as yet we have but a fragment of the book. The portion now published breaks off abruptly at the accession of Queen Victoria. Lord Melbourne, Lord Palmerston, Lord Stanley, Sir Robert Peel, and others, were then in mid-career, and it would be a great mistake to suppose that any passages in the volumes before us contain the author's matured opinion of their characters and services.

Having dwelt thus long on the author, we have left ourselves little space to speak of the work itself; but, as said above, this is a case in which the value of the book is so dependent upon the opinion we form of the writer, that we could not better express the value we put upon it. We believe that the Greville Journals will take their place in the standard literature of our country, beside the Diary of Samuel Pepys, and the Diary of John Evelyn, of former days; and the Journals of Sir Samuel Romilly, and other works, of our own. It is difficult for us, in the present day, to judge in what estimation the work will be held by those who come after us. It is so pleasant to us to recall the events of early life, to glance over pages full of familiar names, to see the secret motives of actions which once engrossed all our attention, and still influence our well-being; to read familiar anecdotes of great men of our own generation; that in the charm which the book has upon ourselves we may misjudge its historical value. But our belief is, that without exactly resembling any one of the works with which we have compared it, this book has many of the merits of each, and will be read by our successors with as much pleasure as we study the days of Charles II. in the pages of Pepys and Evelyn. Though wanting the central figure which makes Boswell's picture of the literary society of the days of Johnson so perfect, Mr. Greville possesses much of the power of Boswell in bringing individual characters before us in their sayings. We say emphatically in their sayings, for of personal description there are but few instances.

It is not easy to select passages which shall give a fair idea of a work so desultory; but the following, which refer to the most illustrious character, and to one of the most prominent characters, of the times,—we mean the Duke of Wellington and Lord Brougham,—will illustrate the writer's style of recording the impressions of the moment, as well as his opportunities of observation. Wellington and Brougham, though living for many years after the accession of Queen Victoria, may be considered to have closed their political career at that time, and the opinions formed of them by the writer are less likely to be changed by

Digitized by Google

what is written in the volumes yet unpublished, than those recorded of many other persons.

There is no one on whom more severe judgments are passed than the Duke of Wellington; and yet the result is to bring into strong view the noble simplicity of his character. In the following passage we have a specimen of the candour with which the Duke could speak of one with whom he had been thrown into violent opposition.

"The Duke talked of Canning a great deal the other day at my mother's. He said his talents were astonishing, his compositions admirable; that he possessed the art of saying exactly what was necessary, and passing over those topics on which it was not advisable to touch; his fertility and resources inexhaustible. He thought him the finest speaker he had ever heard. Though he prided himself extremely on his compositions, he would patiently endure any criticisms upon such papers as he submitted for the consideration of the Cabinet, and would allow them to be altered in any way that was suggested. He particularly (the Duke) had often 'cut and slashed' his papers, and Canning never made the least objection, but was always ready to adopt the suggestions of his colleagues. It was not so, however, in conversation and discussion. Any difference of opinion or dissent from his views threw him into ungovernable rage; and on such occasions he flew out with a violence which, the Duke said, had often compelled him to be silent, that he might not be involved in bitter personal altercation. He said that Canning was usually very silent in the Cabinet, seldom spoke at all; but when he did he maintained his opinions with extraordinary tenacity. He said he was one of the idlest of men. This I do not believe, for I have always heard that he saw everything and did everything himself. Not a despatch was received that he did not read, nor one written that he did not dictate or correct."[k]

In the following the author gives the less favourable side of the Duke's character.

"I am persuaded that he deludes himself by some process of extraordinary false reasoning, and that the habits of intense volition, jumbled up with party prejudices, old associations, and exposure to never-ceasing flattery, have produced the remarkable result we see in his conduct; notwithstanding the enormous blunders he has committed, and his numerous and flagrant inconsistencies, he has never lost his confidence in himself, and what is more curious, has contrived to retain that of a host of followers. In each particular act and on every fresh occasion there appear in him a decision, singleness of purpose, and straightforwardness which are inseparable from a conviction of being in the right, and he never seems to apprehend for a moment that he can be liable to the imputation of any selfish or dis-

[k] Vol. i., p. 108.

Digitized by Google

honourable motive; and strange and paradoxical as it may appear, I do not think he is justly liable to it except when he is under the influence of some strong personal feeling. Such was his jealousy and dislike of Canning; and this led him into, perhaps, the most enormous of all his political misdeeds, the overthrow of the Corn Bill of 1827. Upon other occasions I attribute his conduct to the circumstance of his being governed by one leading idea, and to his incapability of taking enlarged and comprehensive views of political affairs, such as embrace not only the complex relations of the present, but the ostensible probabilities of the future. His judgment, instead of being determined by profound habits of reflection, an extensive knowledge of history, and accurate acquaintance with human nature, seems to be wholly influenced by his own wishes and his own conception of what the exigencies of the moment require. It would not be difficult, I think; and perhaps I may hereafter attempt to apply this delineation of his disposition to the events of his life, and to show how the leading idea in his mind has been the constant guide he has followed, sometimes to the detriment of the best interests of the country and sometimes to that of his own reputation." [1]

The author's more favourable view, and that which greatly predominated, is expressed in the following among many other passages. The second was written at a time when the extreme odium which the Duke had incurred by his disastrous opposition to all measures of reform was beginning to give way:—

"Met the Duke of Wellington at dinner yesterday, and afterwards had a long talk with him, not on politics. I never see and converse with him without reproaching myself for the sort of hostility I feel and express towards his political conduct, for there are a simplicity, a gaiety, and natural urbanity and good humour in him, which are remarkably captivating in so great a man." [m]

"I was marvellously struck (we rode together through St. James' Park) with the profound respect with which the Duke is treated, everybody we met taking off their hats to him, everybody in the park rising as he went by, and every appearance of his inspiring great reverence. I like this symptom; and it is more remarkable because it is not popularity, but a much higher feeling towards him. He has forfeited his popularity more than once; he has taken a line of politics directly counter to the popular bias: but though in moments of excitement he is attached and vilified (and his broken windows, which I wish he would mend, still preserve a record of the violence of the mob), when the excitement subsides there is always a returning sentiment of admiration and respect for him, kept alive by the recollection of his splendid actions, such as no one else ever inspired. Much too as I have regretted and censured the enormous errors of his political career (at times), I believe that this

[1] Vol. iii, p. 173.

[m] Vol. ii., p. 305. June 1st, 1832.

Digitized by Google

sentiment is in a great degree produced by the justice which is done to his political character,—sometimes mistaken, but always high-minded and patriotic, and never mean, false, or selfish. If he has aimed at power, and overrated his own capacity for wielding it, it has been with the purest intentions and the most conscientious views. I believe firmly that no man had ever at heart to a greater degree the honour and glory of his country; and hereafter, when justice will be done to his memory, and his character and conduct be scanned with impartial eyes, if his capacity for government appears unequal to the exigencies of the times in which he was placed at the head of affairs, the purity of his motives and the noble character of his ambition will be amply acknowledged." [n]

The character of Lord Brougham was one which must have afforded a delightful study to Greville, and the anecdotes of him are numerous:—

"Brougham will come in for Yorkshire without a contest; his address was very eloquent. He is rather mad, without a doubt; his speeches this year have sometimes been more brilliant than ever they were; but who, with such stupendous talents, was ever so little considered? We admire him as we do a fine actor, and no one ever possessed such enormous means, and displayed a mind so versatile, fertile, and comprehensive, and yet had so little efficacy and influence. He told me just before he left town that Yorkshire had been proposed to him, but that he had written word that he would not stand, nor spend a guinea, nor go there, nor even take the least trouble about the concerns of any one of his constituents if they elected him; but he soon changed his note." [o]

Brougham's conduct during the formation of the Reform Ministry, his scorn and indignation at the offer by Lord Grey of the Attorney-Generalship, his preparation for revenge, and his final acceptance of the Great Seal so reluctantly offered, are all related, and the following amusing account is given of the evening after he had taken his seat on the Woolsack:—

"Dined yesterday at Sefton's; nobody there but Lord Grey and his family, Brougham and Montrord, the latter just come from Paris. It was excessively agreeable. Lord Grey in excellent spirits, and Brougham, whom Sefton bantered from the beginning to the end of dinner. Be Brougham's political errors what they may, his gaiety, temper, and admirable social qualities, make him delightful, to say nothing of his more solid merits of liberality, generosity, and charity; for charity it is to have taken the whole family of one of his brothers who is dead,—nine children, and maintained and educated them. . . . . Sefton did nothing but quiz Brougham. 'My Lord,' every minute. 'What does his Lordship say?' 'I am sure it is very

---

[n] Vol. ii., p. 372. [o] Vol. ii., p. 116.

Digitized by Google

condescending of his Lordship to speak to such canaille as us,' and a thousand jokes. After dinner he walked out before him with the fire shovel for a mace, and left him no peace all the evening." [p]

On another occasion the writer says:—

"His friends think him much altered in spirits and appearance: he has never shaken off his unhappiness at his brother's death, to whom he seems to have been tenderly attached. It is only just to acknowledge his virtues in private life, which are unquestionably conspicuous. I am conscious of having often spoken of him with asperity, and it is some satisfaction to my conscience to do him this justice. . . . . I believe what I have said of Brougham to be correct in the main,—that he is false, tricking, ambitious, and unprincipled, and as such I will show him up when I can; but though I do not like him, and he has offended me,—that is, has wounded my vanity (the greatest of all offences), I only feel it the more necessary on that account to be on my guard against my own impressions and prejudices, and to take every opportunity of exhibiting the favourable side of the picture, and render justice to the talents and virtues which cannot be denied him." [q]

The following passage, which brings the Duke and Brougham on the scene together, is highly characteristic of both:—

"March 22nd, 1835.—A few nights ago Brougham was speaking in the House of Lords upon Lord Radnor's motion about University Oaths, and was attacking, or rather beginning to attack, the Duke of Wellington in that tone of insolent sarcasm which is so familiar to him, when in the midst of his harangue, the Duke from the opposite side lifted up his finger and said, loud enough to be heard, 'Now take care what you say next.' As if panic-struck, Brougham broke off and ran upon some other tack. The House is so narrow that the Lords can almost whisper across it, and the menacing action and words of the Duke reached Brougham at once. This odd anecdote rests upon much concurrent evidence. Alvanley told it to De Ros, and Lord Salisbury said he was sitting close to the Duke and witnessed it. The Chancellor afterwards confirmed it."

The comparative merits of Brougham and Macaulay, as conversationists, are thus described:—

"Macaulay is a great talker, and pours floods of knowledge on all subjects; but the gracefulness, lightness, and variety are wanting in his talk which are so conspicuous in his writings. There is not enough alloy in the metal of his conversation: it is too didactic, it is all too good, and not sufficiently flexible, plastic, and diversified for general society. Brougham, on the other hand, is all life, spirit, and gaiety,—from grave to gay, from lively to severe,—dashing through every description of folly and fun, dealing in those

[p] Vol. ii., p. 69. [q] Vol. iii., p. 76.

Digitized by Google

rapid transitions by which the attention and imagination are arrested and excited; always amusing, always instructive, never tedious; elevated to the height of the greatest intellect, and familiar with the most abstruse subjects, and at the same time conciliating the humble pretensions of inferior minds by dropping into the midst of their pursuits and objects with a fervour and intensity of interest which surprises and delights his associates, and above all, puts them at their ease."

"*Quantum mutatus*," the writer adds, in 1850,—"All this has long ceased to be true of Brougham. Macaulay, without having either the wit or the charm which constitutes the highest kind of colloquial excellence or success, is a marvellous, an unrivalled (in his way), and a delightful talker." [r]

The following passage gives an amusing sketch of a Cabinet, by the Prime Minister himself:—

"I came up with Melbourne to London. He is uneasy about the state of the country, about the desire for change, and the general restlessness that prevails. We discussed the different members of the Government, and he agreed that John Russell had acted unwarrantably in making the speech he did the other day at Torquay about the ballot, which, though hypothetical, was nothing but an invitation to the advocates of ballot to agitate for it: this, too, from a Cabinet Minister! Then comes an awkward sort of explanation, that what he said was in his *individual* capacity, as if he had any right so to speak. Melbourne spoke of Brougham, who, he said, was tossed about in perpetual caprices, that he was fanciful and sensitive, and actuated by all sorts of littlenesses, even with regard to people so insignificant that it is difficult to conceive how he can ever think about them; that he is Conservative, but under the influence of his old connections, particularly of the saints. His friends are so often changed that it is not easy to follow him in this respect. Durham used to be one, now he hates him; he has a high opinion of Sefton! of his judgment!! What is talent, what are great abilities, when one sees the gigantic intellect of Brougham so at fault? Not only does the world manage to go on when little wisdom guides it; but how ill it may go with a great deal of *talent*, which, however, is different from *wisdom*. He asked me what I thought of Richmond, and I told him that he was ignorant and narrow-minded, but a good sort of fellow, only appearing to me, who had known him all my life, in an odd place as a Cabinet Minister. He said he was sharp, quick, the King liked him, and he stood up to Durham more than any other man in the Cabinet, and that altogether he was not unimportant; so that the ingredients of this Cabinet seem to be put there to neutralize one another, and to be good for nothing else; because Durham has an overbearing temper, and his father-in-law is weak, there must be a man without any other merit than spirit to curb that temper. He talked of Ireland, and the difficulty of

[r] Vol. iii., p. 338.

Digitized by Google

settling the question there, that the Archbishop of Canterbury was willing to reform the Church, but not to alienate any of its revenues. 'Not,' I asked, 'for the payment of Catholic clergy?' 'No, not from Protestant uses." I told him there was nothing to be done but to pull down the edifice and rebuild it. He said you would have all the Protestants against you, but he did not appear to differ. To this things must come at last. Melbourne is exceedingly anxious to keep Lord Hill and Fitzroy Somerset at the head of the army, from which the violent of his party would gladly oust them; but he evidently contemplates the possibility of having occasion for the army, and does not wish to tamper with the service or play any tricks with it. It is curious to see the working and counterworking of his real opinions and principles with his false position; and the mixture of bluntness, facility and shrewdness, discretion, levity and seriousness, which, colouring his mind and character by turns, make up the strange compound of his thoughts and his actions." [a]

The book abounds in lively anecdotes of men of the day, as, for instance, of the two Grants (Charles and Robert), who were always together, and both very forgetful and unpunctual. "Somebody said that if you asked Charles to dine with you at six on Monday, you were likely to have Robert at seven on Tuesday." Of old Lord Clifden, who said grace after dinner by mistake, *thinking it was Sunday.* Of the Emperor of Russia, who was so charmed with Oxford that he resolved to build a similar city in his own dominions; and so delighted with our political institutions, that he determined that on his return to Russia *he would have an opposition.* But our space is nearly exhausted.

Thus far we have spoken of the work before us in regard to its historical and literary value. It may be asked, Have we nothing to say, as Christian observers and as Christian advocates, with reference to the religious and moral aspect of the times described, and of the author's qualifications to judge of them and present them to us in this light? Our answer is, that with regard to the author we have said nearly all that we wish to say, or think ought at present to be said. A remark which we have made above in regard to some of the characters described,—that the present volumes are but a fragment of the work, and that it would be unfair to take the author's judgments here given as conclusive,—applies with special force to the opinion we form of the author himself. The published portion of his journal comprises a period of nineteen years, from 1818 to 1837; what has yet to come will comprise a period of twenty-eight years of matured experience, down to the author's death in 1865. We feel, therefore, that it must be left to those who come after us to judge of the character of the author in the highest sense of the

[a] Vol. 2, p. 322.

Digitized by Google

term. Of the riper years of his life we know nothing, and were we to judge of the whole from the earlier portion we should probably judge unfairly. The volumes we possess show strong evidence of a mind advancing in moral perceptions, and we decline to form any judgment of the standard of Christian faith to which the author attained, from these records of his earlier years. If we did otherwise our task must be a painful one, for it would be difficult to draw a picture of the religious sense of an intellectual mind more degraded by worldly society and the vice of gaming, than that which Greville has painted of himself; when with something of the sneer of the infidel,—but we suspect with more of the superstition of the gambler,—he vowed and paid a silver horse-shoe to the Virgin of the Pantheon of Rome if his horse should win a certain race. But there are several indications that Charles Greville, amidst the worldly subjects which enchained him, sighed not only for the nobler pursuits of the intellectual, but felt the longings of the spiritual man. With this remark we must leave the subject. The book before us is a picture of society by a man of the world. It brings before us the society of the youth of those now passing away; the morals and the manners of the reign of George IV.; and upon this subject we shall hope hereafter to make a few remarks for which we have not space in the present article.

Before we close we must offer one observation, which applies to the editor rather than to the author of the work. It is, that there are passages published which we think should have been omitted, at any rate for many years to come. There are, we are fully aware, certain penalties attaching to high station; and those who by birth or inclination are placed in the exalted positions of public life forego some of the privileges of private individuals. But there are bounds to this rule even in the case of the most exalted of all, in regard to family ties and affections, and we doubt whether those bounds have not in this instance been transgressed.

RITUALISTS AT THEIR DEVOTIONS.

OUR readers must have had their interest excited during the past month by "a very pretty quarrel," in the *Times* newspaper, between the well-known Monsignor Capel, and Canon Liddon of St. Paul's, on the question of the Romanizing tendencies of Ritualistic doctrine and practice. The Monsignor, in his reply

Digitized by Google

to Mr. Gladstone's famous pamphlet on the "Vatican Decrees," had stated (what to ordinary people appears true enough), that "beyond doubt these men" (the Ritualistic clergy and party) "are unintentionally, but not the less assuredly, disseminating several doctrines of the Roman Church;" and he mentioned the names of Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon among their leaders and exponents. This provoked the Canon to attempt a reply, the gist of which (unluckily for him) was that certain so-called Roman doctrines were "*Catholic*," not exclusively "Roman;" and that in disseminating "Catholic" teaching on the Real Presence, Confession, Absolution, and Prayers to the Saints, the Ritualists were simply carrying out the doctrines of our own Prayer-book, and approving themselves the genuine children of the English Church. The Monsignor, not so easily silenced, and doubtless glad of the opportunity, retorts with a string of quotations from approved Ritualistic Manuals of Devotion, sanctioned by the well-known names of Pusey, Carter of Clewer, etc., in which he amply substantiates the correctness of his allegations. Canon Liddon, compelled to admit that such specimens were certainly more Roman than Catholic, but unwilling to abandon his friends, at first vainly tries to set down their objectionable phraseology to "inadvertence;" then reluctantly yielding this theory, speaks of them as "fungi," or "excrescences;" and promises his best efforts to promote their excision from current devotional literature; while he declines, on Dr. Pusey's part and his own (be their sympathies what they may), to be personally responsible for what these pious and devoted, but perhaps too incautiously fervent, Churchmen may say or do!

We are not much concerned to comment upon the vigorous onslaught of the Monsignor, or the lamentably weak defence of the Canon. One thing however has certainly resulted from this newspaper controversy, and we heartily thank both disputants for it. It has roused considerable public attention to the whole subject; and we hope and believe that the attention thus excited will not be easily suffered to subside. A jealous scrutiny of the contents of devotional and other religious works, which find their way so quietly into many heedless families, would considerably astonish unsuspecting parents and guardians; while a visit to a Ritualistic bookseller's would reveal such stores of barely-concealed, or even unconcealed, Popish rubbish (offered for sale as Church theology, and stamped with the "*imprimatur*" of well-known names), that nothing but John Bull's utter indifference and apathy on religious matters generally, and Church matters in particular, can possibly account for their unnoticed appearance and circulation.

We found, a few days since, lying upon the counter of a book-

Digitized by Google

seller in one of our quiet little watering-places, a volume of this kind, which on inquiry we ascertained to have been ordered for the use of a High-Church nursing Sisterhood in the neighbourhood. It was a new discovery to us, and probably may be to our readers, that such works were in actual use there. To keep alive the interest stirred by the Capel and Liddon controversy, and to show that the allegations made by the Roman Catholic disputant rest on a very solid basis of fact, we intend to give our readers in this paper some little account of it.

The Compiler or Editor does not venture to give his name, and we can hardly wonder when we read the title of the work: "The Day Office of the Church, according to the Kalendar of the Church of England: to which are added the Order for the administration of the Reserved Eucharist, Penance and Unction; together with the Office of the Dead, Commendation of a Soul, divers Benedictions and Offices, and full Rubrical Directions." The book is, in point of fact, a translation, with wonderfully little pruning or alteration, of the "*Horæ Diurnæ Breviarii Romani;* and, as the Editor does not scruple to tell us in the Preface, is "*not intended to have a merely literary value; but for the actual use of the clergy, religious communities, and the faithful of the English Communion.*" The forms, indeed, at the end of the book, "for the administration of the Sacraments of Penance, of Unction of the Sick, of Communion with the Reserved Eucharist, together with a collection of Benedictions, and other matter," will, the Editor hopes, "*supply some wants much felt by the clergy,*" and be "*most likely to prove practicable and useful in the present condition of our Communion.*"

That these offices are intended for public rather than for private worship is manifest, from the rules given for their recitation "in choir;" and that the ultimate object of the compiler is not to add to, but to supersede by their use, the old English Prayer-book, is plain enough; not only from the fact of these offices for "*Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers,* and *Complins*" (together with what the Editor is pleased to call "the Mass"), occupying the greater part of every day; but also from the contrast of their spirit and tone with that of our own Service-book. No one can reasonably doubt that the daily use of this Manual of Devotion must tend gradually, but surely, to widen the distance between the worshippers and their own Church, while it will as surely and insensibly establish a bond of connection between them and the Roman Communion. As Mr. Orby Shipley says, in his "*Four Cardinal Virtues,*"—"The first point is to secure people's interest in the change, or to wean their attachment from that which is to be changed. And to this end the public mind must be 'educated' up to the point of change."

Digitized by Google

What a powerful means of 'education' formulas of devotion always have been, and are, needs no proof.

The variations from the strict letter of the "Breviarium Romanum," which the Editor "has thought himself at liberty to make" in the work before us, are stated in the preface. They chiefly consist in the substitution of the English Calendar (with large additions) for that of the Roman Breviary; in the substitution of references, in antiphons, short chapters, etc., to the Epistles and Gospels of our own Prayer-book, in place of the ordinary Roman ones; in more modified invocations of the Virgin and the saints, than is usual in the hymns and antiphons of the Roman Church; and in such adaptations of the forms for administering Penance, Communion of the Sick, and Extreme Unction; and for hallowing of holy water, altars, altar-linen, vestments, crosses, images of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints, etc., as the Editor seems to think may prove "practicable and useful" in our present condition. We will give a specimen or two of the methods adopted under each of these heads.

I. To increase the value of the Kalendar to "Scottish Catholics," the names of a number of saints inserted in the Scotch Prayer-book of 1637, are introduced, with appropriate commemorations for each day. Accordingly we are introduced to St. David, St. Kentigern, St. Constantine, St. Patrick, St. Cuthbert, St. Cyril, St. Serf, St. Columba, St. Palladius, St. Ninian, St. Adamnan, St. Margaret, St. Ode, and St. Drostane. As a specimen of the Collects to be used on the anniversaries of these little-known worthies, we insert the one for the 1st April, —St. Gilbert, Bishop and Confessor (p. 193):—

"O God, who didst choose to give renown to the blessed Bishop Gilbert, by the healing of many sick persons, and by signs and wonders, grant for his sake, we beseech Thee, that we may be healed of all sickness, both of mind and body, and also brought with him to everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Besides this addition in the interest of our northern brethren, the Editor has thought fit to admit into the Kalendar, for more general satisfaction, the Feasts of Corpus Christi, the Assumption of the Virgin, the Commemoration of All Souls, the Feasts of St. Thomas (áBeckett) of Canterbury, St. Joseph, the Guardian Angels, and the Commemoration of St. Paul. His plea for this somewhat startling innovation is, that though the observance of these days "is not explicitly ordered by the English Church, yet they are of such universal observance in western Christendom, and are so frequently commemorated by pious persons and religious communities among us, by way of special or private devotion, that it has been thought good to insert the Offices for such

Digitized by Google

days in this Diurnal." For the convenience, however, of such worshippers as may demur to the Scotch saints and to these additional feasts, a special mark has been set against them, and "every provision made for readily and conveniently omitting them."

Of the devotions provided for these festivals we will give a few brief specimens, to enable our readers to judge of the whole. The service for "Corpus Christi" is almost identical with that of the Breviary, with translations of the hymns "*Pange, lingua, gloriosi*" and "*Verbum supernum prodiens,*" not forgetting the stanza of the former hymn:—

"Word made flesh: true bread He maketh
By His word, true flesh to be;
Blood Christ makes the wine He taketh,—
What though sense no change can see?
Yet no faithful spirit shaketh:
Faith can teach the mystery."

"The Assumption of the Virgin" in like manner follows closely the Roman pattern of devotion. What that is, let the Collect for the Vigil, "*Deus qui virginalem,*" and the hymn, "*Ave Maris Stella,*" show us:—

THE COLLECT.

"O God, who didst vouchsafe to choose the virgin womb of blessed Mary as a shrine wherein Thou mightest rest: grant, we beseech Thee, that we being defended by her intercessions, may joyfully take part in her coming festival, who livest and reignest," etc.

"*Ave Maris Stella.*

"Star of ocean fairest,
Mother, God who bearest,
Virgin thou immortal,
Heaven's blissful portal.

"Ave thou receivest,
Gabriel's word believest,
Change to peace and gladness,
Eva's name of sadness.

"Loose the bonds of terror,
Lighten blinded error,
All our ills repressing,
Pray for every blessing.

"Mother's care displaying,
Offer Him thy praying,
Who, when born our brother,
Chose thee for His mother.

"Virgin all excelling,
Gentle past our telling,
Pardoned sinners render
Gentle, chaste, and tender.

"In pure paths direct us,
On our way protect us,
Till on Jesus gazing,
We shall join thy praising.

"Father, Son eternal,
Holy Ghost supernal,
With one praise we bless Thee,
Three in One confess Thee. Amen."

Of the commemoration of "*All Souls*" it will be sufficient to say that the devotions are from the Romish *Office of the Dead.* St. Joseph is thus characterized in the hymn "*Iste quem lœti*:"—

Digitized by Google

"Conquering death, he leaves his fleshly burden,
Calmly he slumbers, rest he gains eternal;
Lo, round his peaceful head a garland glitters
Of light supernal!

"There as he reigneth, earnestly beseech we
That he may pour his fervent intercessions,
Praying for heavenly peace, and for the pardon
Of our transgressions."

And the Collect for this feast day runs thus:—

"O Lord, we beseech Thee, grant us Thy help for the sake of the spouse of Thy most holy mother, that those things which by our own power we cannot obtain, may be given us at His intercession who livest and reignest, God, world without end. Amen."

To "St. Thomas of Canterbury" two days are assigned: his Translation, on the 7th July; his Feast, on the 29th December. We hardly know which of the Collects appointed for these days is the more impious, but perhaps the one for the Translation exceeds the other. It runs thus:—

"THE COLLECT.

"O God, Who dost suffer us to celebrate the Translation of blessed Thomas Thy martyr and bishop, we humbly implore Thee, that for his sake, and at his prayers, we may be translated from sin to virtue and from bondage to the kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

For the festival of "The Holy Guardian Angels," October 2nd, we have the accustomed Romish devotions, including the hymns "*Custodes hominum psallimus Angelos*," and "*Æterne rector siderum*," from the latter of which we select two stanzas:—

"Now send that Angel to our side
Whom Thou hast chosen as our guide;
Each spot of sin that stains the heart
Shall at his presence swift depart.

"Right quickly let him rend and tear
The envious dragon's cunning snare:
Lest spirits, heedless of their way,
Be slain, while 'mid the toils they stray."

At the "Commemoration of St. Paul," June 30th, the Collect used could hardly be supposed by any one conversant with the doctrine of the holy Apostle, to have found favour in his eyes, had he been permitted to see it when upon earth:—

"THE COLLECT.

"O God, Who hast taught the multitude of the Gentiles by the preaching of blessed Paul the Apostle, grant we beseech Thee, that we may know that we have the aid of his prayers with Thee whose birthday festival we do keep. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Digitized by Google

Such are the additions made to the English Kalendar "for the use of English Catholics;" and when we add that to all the names left in the almanack by our Reformers for convenience sake, and not with any idea of their being commemorated, the due Romish service is appended, with very little, if any alteration, our readers may conjecture how far the process of approximation to Roman usages is intended to be carried, and of how much is the worth of the so-called "variations" from the strict letter of the Breviarium.

II. As to the changes of the Roman antiphons, short chapters, etc., at special seasons, for those more familiar to us in our own Epistles and Gospels for such days, the Editor might have saved himself the trouble and pains he has bestowed upon a matter of so little consequence. "To strain at the gnat" of minute Ritual diversity, while he so complacently "swallows the camel" of distinctively Romish doctrine, however characteristic of men of this school, is nothing so very particular to remark upon. There these petty variations stand amidst the muddy ocean of Roman devotions,—"*apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto*,"—"a half-pennyworth of bread to an intolerable deal of sack." We will not detain our readers by directing attention to them, specially as the Editor is careful to inform us in the preface, that "while thus departing from the letter, he has kept carefully to the spirit and intention of the Roman Breviary, which is, of course, to establish a band of connection between the altar and choir services by introducing Scriptures and collects from the former into the latter."

III. We pass on now to the Editor's *third* departure from the strict letter of the original Breviarium: his modification of *direct* invocations to the Virgin Mary, saints, and angels, in the use of these devotional offices. On this point it is well to hear his own words in the preface:—

"Considering the great differences of opinion which exist among sincere and pious Catholics in the English communion as to the desirability of directly asking the Mother of God, and the Saints, for the assistance of their prayers, it has been thought best to exclude such petitions from hymns and antiphons; the French Breviaries (chiefly that of Paris) supplying substitutes, in the words of Scripture, for such of the latter as it was desired to replace. *In two places, however, these invocations have been retained: in the hymn 'Ave Maris Stella,' and in the Litanies;* these need, nevertheless, present no obstacles to scrupulous consciences, as a special Hymn, containing no invocation, has been provided for use at Vespers on each Feast of our Lady, as a substitute, if such is desired, for the former; and the invocations in the latter have been inclosed in brackets, and can be readily passed over. On this subject it is worth calling to mind what one of the greatest living theologians of the English com-

Digitized by Google

munion has lately written: 'That it cannot be doubted that in the latter part of the fourth century the great Fathers who secured and transmitted our faith, practised and taught it:' *i.e.*, the custom of 'directly asking the saints to use their intercessions in whose efficacy they believed.' And again: 'In principle, then, there is no question, herein, between us and any other portion of the Catholic Church.'—*Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles, by the Bishop of Brechin. Vol. ii., pp.* 404—421."

The "*Ave Maris Stella*" we have already quoted at length. What the invocations in the Litanies are, which, if our consciences are not too scrupulous, we are invited to use as English Catholics, let us now see. We find them in the Litany (p. xlix), and the Lesser Litany in the Order for the Commendation of a Soul (p. lix.) Let an extract or two suffice.

"Holy Mary, Holy Mother of God, Holy Virgin of virgins, St. Michael, St. Gabriel, St. Raphael; all ye holy Angels and Archangels; all ye holy orders of blessed Spirits, St. John Baptist, St. Joseph; all ye holy Patriarchs and Prophets, and all ye holy Apostles and Evangelists; all ye holy Disciples of the Lord, all ye holy Innocents, St. Stephen, St. Lawrence, St. Vincent, St. Fabian, and St. Sebastian, St. John and St. Paul, St. Cosmas and St. Damain, St. Gervase and St. Protase. All ye holy Priests and Levites, all ye holy Monks and Hermits; all ye holy Virgins and Widows; all ye holy men and women of God, pray for us, make intercession for us."

The unbracketed modifications, to suit alike the scrupulous and unscrupulous, abound. The "*Ave Maria*" is pruned for use by omitting the concluding sentence: "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and in the hour of our death;" and we are taught to use it thus:—

"Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the Fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Amen."

The formula of Confession seems to be retained as quite innocent and lawful (p. 9):—

"I confess to God Almighty, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to you, brethren, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my fault, by my own fault, by my own most grievous fault. Wherefore I beg blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, brethren, to pray for me to the Lord our God."

The Collect for the "Sunday at Prime" is another unbracketed piece of innocent devotion:—

Digitized by Google

"Let holy Mary and all the Saints pray for us to the Lord, that we may be worthy to obtain from Him help and salvation, who liveth and reigneth for ever and ever. Amen."—(p. 10.)

Though direct invocations of the saints are but few, yet prayers to God that the saints may pray for us, and that their intercessions may be heard on our behalf, are superabundant. For example, the Collect for the "Commemoration of Holy Mary" at Vespers and Lauds (p. 56):—

"Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that we, Thy servants, may rejoice in continual health of body and mind; and at the intercession of the glorious and blessed ever Virgin Mary, deliver us from all pain in this life, and grant us the fruition of everlasting joy."

Or, again, the Collect for St. Benedict (21st March), p. 192:

"Let the intercession, O Lord, we beseech Thee, of the blessed Abbat Benedict, obtain for us Thy favour: that those things which of our own worthiness we cannot attain, may at his intercession be granted unto us, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Or, again, the Collect for St. Dunstan (19th May), p. 197:—

"O God, who hast translated the Blessed Dunstan, Thy High Priest, to Thy heavenly kingdom, grant that we, for his glorious sake, may pass to never-ending joys, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

It can hardly be supposed that persons accustomed day by day to use such indirect invocations of saints in their devotions would be scrupulous enough to pass over the more direct prayers to them in the Litanies. Doubtless in new editions of this Manual we shall find the brackets quietly dispensed with, as useless and out of harmony with the rest of the devotions, and the observations in the preface recast, as no longer needed to allay the uneasiness of timid and over-conscientious minds.

IV. We will conclude our remarks on this volume by a specimen or two of the adapted forms for special occasions, which the Editor has obligingly added "to supply some wants much felt by the clergy."

For the convenience of those who may wish to commemorate saints, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, bishops, doctors, virgins, etc., not specially given a place in the kalendar, blank forms are provided of various kinds, with antiphons, short chapters, and collects, to be filled up as occasion requires. For example (p. 11):—

"Hear our prayers, we beseech Thee, O Lord, which we bring on this solemnity of blessed N., Thy Confessor and Bishop; and for the sake of the good deeds of him who was accounted worthy to

Digitized by Google

serve Thee, absolve us from all our sins; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

FOR A DOCTOR.

"O God, who didst give blessed N to Thy people to be a Minister of eternal salvation; grant, we beseech Thee, that as he has been the instructor of our life here upon earth, he may be our intercessor in heaven, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Then follow a series of other forms either directly translated or adapted from the Breviarium: such as, the Office of the Dead, the Gradual Psalms, the Penitential Psalms, the Litany, the Manner of Administering the Sacrament of Penance, the Order for Communicating the Sick with the Reserved Eucharist, the Manner of Administering the Sacrament of Unction to the Sick, the Order for the Commendation of a Soul, Divers Benedictions, *e.g.*, Hallowing of Holy Water, Benediction of an Altar, of all manner of Priestly Vestments, of Altar Linen, of a Corporal, of a Chalice and Paten, of a Tabernacle, or of a Vessel for Reserving the Blessed Eucharist, of a New Cross, of any Vessel or Ornament for use at the Altar or in the Church, of an Image of our Lord Jesus Christ, of an Image or Medal of a Saint, of Oil, of a New House, of anything whatsoever; the Blessing of the Table (*i.e.*, our dinner and tea tables), the Itinerary, Thanksgiving for a safe Return after a Journey. Preparation for Mass: Prayers to be said when the Priest puts on the Sacerdotal Vestments. Thanksgiving after Mass: Prayers to be said before the celebration of Mass and Communion. Prayers to be said after celebration and Communion, etc.

Our limits will not suffer us to do more than give the titles of these various helps to the clergy in their ministrations. We will, however, by way of showing how far Romewards a devout Ritualist is enabled to go, give one form of Benediction; and as the administration of the Communion to the sick is what might be carried on in any parish of the kingdom where a Ritualist curate, duly licensed by the Bishop, is the "Priest in charge," we will conclude by giving our readers this new rendering of our English Prayer-book at full length.

BENEDICTION OF AN IMAGE OR MEDAL OF A SAINT.

V. Our help. R. Who hath. V. The Lord be with you. R. And with .

LET US PRAY.

"Almighty and everlasting God Who hast not forbidden us to carve or to paint figures or images of Thy saints, that as oft as we behold their resemblances with the eyes of the body we may behold their holy examples with the eyes of the soul, and be so stirred up to follow their pattern and holiness; we beseech Thee that it may

Digitized by Google

please Thee to bl + ess and to hal + low this figure fashioned in honour and in memory of [the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ; *or* of blessed N, Thy apostle, *or* martyr, *or* confessor, *or* virgin, etc.]; and grant that whosoever before this figure shall endeavour worthily to reverence and honour [the Most blessed Virgin, *or* Thy glorious Apostle, *or* Martyr, etc.]; may for *his* sake and at *his* prayers obtain from Thee grace in this life present, and everlasting glory in the world to come, through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Then shall it be sprinkled with holy water.

THE ORDER FOR COMMUNICATING THE SICK WITH THE RESERVED EUCHARIST.

The blessed Eucharist when reserved for sick persons shall be kept in some decent and becoming place on or near the Altar of the church or oratory.

The Sacrament of the Body shall be kept in a Pyx of gold or silver, the Sacrament of the Blood in a Phial or Vessel of glass, and never in one of metal, which is likely to corrode and corrupt the consecrated Species.

When a sick person is to be communicated there shall be prepared in his chamber a table with a fair linen cloth thereon, adorned with two wax candles, or at the least with one, and with a Cross or Crucifix and other decent and devout ornaments.

Then shall also be prepared two vessels, one of wine and another of water, and a houselling cloth to spread under the chin of the communicant, and if they will be needed, a vessel of Holy Water and a sprinkler.

The Priest who is to carry the Blessed Eucharist to the sick person should be accompanied by a clerk, or by some pious person, to assist him in his office and for the greater honour of the Sacrament.

The Priest, or else the clerk, will take with him a small Chalice, a surplice, a white stole; and if the sick person's confession is to be heard, or the Anointing administered, a violet one as well, and also a small white burse, containing a corporal, a pale, and a purificator.

At the proper time the Priest will take the vessels containing the Blessed Eucharist from the place where it is reserved, and will put them in a case or bag, which he will reverently suspend round his neck, so that the Sacrament may hang before his breast, and thus with his eyes bent upon the ground, and repeating to himself suitable Psalms and Hymns, he will go to the sick person's house.

When he reacheth the house the candles shall be lighted, and as soon as he entereth the chamber he shall say,—

'Peace be to this house, and to all that dwell in it.'

Then the Priest shall spread the Corporal upon the table and taking the Blessed Eucharist from his neck, shall place it thereon, then he shall kneel and worship; and all in the room shall humbly kneel upon their knees. Then shall the Priest rise and vest him in his surplice.

N.B. If no Holy Water is to be sprinkled the Priest shall pass over all this that followeth between the brackets:—

[*The Priest putting on his violet stole shall then sprinkle the sick person, and the bed, with Holy Water, in the manner of a Cross, saying thus:—*

Digitized by Google

ANT. Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, O Lord, and I shall be clean, etc.

PSALM. Have mercy upon me, O God, after Thy great goodness, etc. Glory be. As it was.

ANT. Thou shalt purge me, etc.

V. Our help is in the name of the Lord.

R. Who hath made heaven and earth, etc., etc.

LET US PRAY.

Graciously hear us, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, everlasting God; and may it please Thee to send Thy holy Angel from heaven to keep, cherish, guard, visit and defend all who dwell in this habitation, through Christ our Lord. Amen.]

Then if the sick person desire to make confession the Priest shall hear it.

Then the Priest, putting on his white stole, shall prepare the Blessed Eucharist, pouring of the Sacrament of the Blood into the small Chalice and covering It with the pall.

This done, the General Confession shall be made either by the sick man himself or by some one present in his name, all, except the Priest, devoutly kneeling.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, etc. Amen.

Then shall the Priest, turning himself to the sick Person, pronounce this Absolution.

Almighty God our Heavenly Father, Who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins, etc. Amen.

Then shall the Priest say,—

Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith, etc.

Then shall the Priest kneel before the Holy Sacrament, and say as follows in the name of the sick person,—

We do not presume to come to this, Thy table, O merciful Lord, etc.

Then shall the Priest proceed to administer the Holy Sacrament; and if any present are to be communicated beside the sick person, they shall receive first and the sick man last.

And when he delivereth the Sacrament of the Body he shall make the sign of the Cross therewith, and he shall say,—

The Body + of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

And when he delivereth the Cup he shall make the sign of the Cross therewith, and shall say,—

The blood + of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

The Communion ended, the Priest shall make the ablutions as at Mass, and shall give them to the sick person to drink; and unless there remain in the Phial any of the Sacrament of the Blood to be carried back again to the Church, he shall cleanse it as well as the Chalice.

Digitized by Google

The Ablutions shall be made thus: first, wine shall be poured into the Phial, and thence into the Chalice. When this has been drunk, a very little wine and more water shall be poured into the Phial, and thence over the forefinger and thumb of the Priest's right hand into the Chalice. When this has been received the Priest shall wipe his fingers, and the Chalice, with the purificator, and shall say this prayer following:—

Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee, etc.

Then shall he turn to the sick person and give this Blessing,—

The peace of God, etc.

If any of the Blessed Eucharist remain in the Pyx, the Priest shall make the sign of the Cross therewith over the sick person when he giveth the Blessing.

If the sick person be unable, by reason of infirmity, from nearness of death, or for any other cause, to drink the ablutions, they may be received by any other person who has communicated with him; or the Priest may pour them into some decent vessel and take them back to the Church with him, to receive them himself after the ablutions of the Mass, when he next celebrateth.

If any of the Blessed Eucharist remain in the vessels, the Priest shall carry it back to the Church with the same reverence with which he brought it, saying to himself suitable Psalms or Hymns of Thanksgiving.

When he reacheth the Church he shall set the Blessed Eucharist upon the Altar, and kneeling down shall worship. Then he shall rise and say,—

V. Thou didst give them Bread from heaven.
R. Containing within Itself all sweetness.
V. The Lord be with you.
R. And with thy spirit.

LET US PRAY.

O God, who in this wonderful Sacrament hast left unto us a Memorial of Thy passion: grant us, we beseech Thee, so to reverence the sacred Mysteries of Thy Body and Blood, that we may ever perceive within ourselves the fruit of Thy redemption, who livest and reignest, etc.

Then if any persons are present he shall in silence make the sign of the Cross over them with the Pyx, and finally shall deposit it in its place.

* * * * * *

If death be imminent and there be danger from delay, so that the Blessed Eucharist must be administered in one kind or not at all, instead of the above longer form, it shall suffice that the General Confession be said by the sick person or by some one present in his name: the Priest giving the accustomed Absolution.

Then having knelt, he shall take the Sacrament from the Pyx, and elevating It and showing It to the sick person, he shall say,—

Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him that taketh away the sins of the world!

And shall say thrice,—

Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my Roof; but speak the word only and my soul shall be healed.

Digitized by Google

The sick person shall say the same words with the Priest, or at least once; then the Priest giving the Eucharist to the sick person, shall say,—

Receive, brother (or sister), the viaticum of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and may it preserve thee from the malicious enemy. and bring thee to everlasting life. Amen.

Then the priest, having made the Ablutions as directed above, shall say,—

V. The Lord be with you.

R. And with thy spirit.

LET US PRAY.

O Holy Lord, Almighty Father, everlasting God, we with confidence beseech Thee, that the most holy Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son, which our brother (*or* sister) hath now received may be to him (*or* her) a remedy both in body and soul unto eternal life, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord; Who liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God, for ever and ever. Amen.

Our readers may now judge for themselves whether Monsignor Capel's claim, that the Ritualists are his fellow-workers, can be substantiated or denied. "It may possibly be Canon Liddon's duty," he says, "*to raise his voice against* such practices of piety, and such devotional expressions of doctrine. All I contend for is, that practical teaching of this kind is assuredly, though unintentionally, spreading our doctrines." Who can doubt it? The Canon chooses to call such doctrines "*fungi*," as though they had sprung up in a night, and might be swept clean away at any moment; but they are the silent, unnoticed, steady growth of years. And where are the Bishops? Mushrooms do not now merely grow spontaneously; they are artificially cultivated in dark places. Have not these Roman boleti been the object of tenderest solicitude in Theological Colleges and Sisterhoods under the especial care and patronage of our Bishops? They may not have ventured down themselves into the cellars in which the *ancipites fungi* were maturing: but when they have been paraded before them, has any plain, manly remonstrance ever been uttered? "These are Romish excrescences, poisonous to the souls of men, away with them." Nay, they have been hard at work ordaining the men who teach these doctrines,—Deacons, Priests; yes, and Bishops too! Can they wonder at the harvest they are reaping? Cadmus sowed the dragon's teeth; and when they sprang up as armed men, subdued and slew them. The modern representatives of that hero of antiquity let their armed men alone, or promote them to high places in their regiments. Is it very wonderful that these pampered warriors colleague with the enemy, and only wait for a convenient opportunity to betray the citadel, when all shall be ripe and ready for his admission?

Digitized by Google

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Communistic Societies of the United States. By Charles Nordhoff. London: Murray. 1875.—This is a book full of interest, but of a very painful kind. It corresponds in some degree to the collections which fill (we cannot say adorn) the shelves of a surgical museum. These are very valuable to the student of pathology, but are repulsive to ordinary beholders. So in Mr. Nordhoff's book we have a collection of moral and religious extravagances carefully chronicled and dealt with in a very friendly spirit. The author has studiously maintained the role of a dispassionate observer; and whether among the celibacy of the Shakers, or the polygamy and polyandry of the Perfectionists, indulges in no critical comment. He relates what he has seen, without dwelling upon the more objectionable features; and on many important points, even in his concluding summary, leaves his readers to form their own conclusions. These must be gathered from the teaching of the Word of God, and from the common sense of mankind. Both will be adverse to the efficacy of these Societies as remedies for the evils under which the world labours. Apart from the fact that the oldest of these institutions cannot claim a century of existence (and some of them are already waning out, so that they have not the element of permanence), the utmost attained by them is a fair amount of material well being, which contrasts favourably with the "rowdy" existence of the miscellaneous population among whom they are to be found. Intellectual and religious progress there is none. In a certain sense, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die," seems to bound the horizon of these communities. It is something to be able to eat and drink; it is still more to be able to do so with temperance and moderation. It is important to abstain from excessive drinking and excessive finery: so far, with certain natures, these societies are helpful; but there is little or no evidence throughout Mr. Nordhoff's volume that salutary influences are brought to bear upon those who most need them. No drunkard is reclaimed, no foolish woman sobered in these communities. In this respect they seem to come short of the corresponding Romish institutions, in which men and women who have led lives of outrageous profligacy condone for past sinfulness by becoming devots and devotes. The French experiment at Icaria, originated by M. Cabet, is a failure; whereas the German societies are all successful. We do not think that the revelations of this book, favourable as they are upon the whole to the success of the immediate experiments recorded, will help at all in solving the difficult questions involved between capital and labour, and cognate questions. In America experiments of this kind are tried under the most favourable conditions, but apparently with very limited and partial results. Communism to be successful is hard work, as Dr. Nordhoff frequently and emphatically remarks. But that is just what the large majority of mankind seek to avoid. If the bees can all hive together, and let the drones starve, honey may be

Digitized by Google

accumulated. But hitherto, at any rate, the drones, if they have not produced yet have preached communism, and look to it as a means for enabling them to live without work: they want the honey from the bees. As a study of religious eccentricity the book is really distressing; it is quite pitiable to see what distempered dreams upon religion can consist in the brains of men naturally shrewd and intelligent, moreover not intentionally irreverent. Crazy fancies and foolish hallucinations, not a whit more rational than what emanate from Romish nunneries and similar institutions, and exactly similar in character, are found even where the Word of God is possessed and held in some honour. Most painful evidence is furnished, that fallen man, whether priest-ridden or not, is labouring under deep-seated spiritual disorder, not to be healed but by the exertion of Almighty power. The record is sometimes very sad and sometimes very sickening, as we read through Mr. Nordhoff's pages; still his book is a very remarkable one.

The Poor Clerk and his Crooked Sixpence.—Homes Homely and Happy. Learn of Me.—School-Boy Courage and its Reward.—Guy Beauchamp's Victory.—Lost and Rescued.—The Cottager and Artizan.—The Child's Companion.—London: Religious Tract Society.—In the first of these volumes a crooked sixpence tells its adventures, and with them is intertwined the story of the poor clerk. Incident therefore is not lacking; for it was at the discretion of the author to string short tales together to any extent. The result however is a pleasant volume, with much wholesome, moral, and religious teaching interspersed. It would, we think, be a favourite in a parish library. The next two are more distinctly didactic. We like "Homes Homely and Happy" much. It is very legible, and is emphatically a book of the class which it is the office of the Society to distribute. A great deal of sound and sensible advice is communicated in a manner intelligible to the simplest folk. It is a very useful publication. "Learn of Me" is a collection of many sayings of our blessed Lord, with some sound and profitable comment upon each of them. It is a small book, but well calculated to warn and to edify. "School-Boy Courage" is a well-told tale, which young folk may read with pleasnre and profit. Our preference however is for "Guy Beauchamp;" which, short story as it is, deserves the most hearty commendation. "Lost and Rescued" is a very tiny book: the adventures of a ragged boy in a Sunday school, with the blessing which resulted. The "Cottager and Artizan" presents a splendid appearance, with a gorgeous illustration from the monkey-house in the Zoological Gardens for its cover. The illustrations are beautiful, and the contents are admirably adapted for the pleasure and instruction of its readers. The "Child's Companion" is filled with beautiful illustrations of a very superior character for a publication of its class. The contents are good and varied; well adapted for the intelligence of small people.

Evening Hours for 1874. *Edited by Lady Barker.—The Home Visitor for* 1874. *Edited by the Rev. P. B. Power. New Series. London: Hunt.* 1875.—These volumes have reached us at a somewhat later period than usual, so that we could not include them in

Digitized by Google

our notice of similar periodicals. In point of appearance and in diversity of contents they are highly creditable to their respective Editors and also to the Publisher. Lady Barker has achieved for herself a special reputation by establishing herself as an authority upon points which, if not of chief importance, yet intimately affect the daily comfort and well-being of mankind. Her papers will be read with the consideration due to an expert. Many will listen to her for "le ventre a des oreilles." But she prefers other claims, and has proved herself as skilful in the concoction of a magazine as of an omelet. The result is a savoury compound, in which all readers will find something to approve and calculated to interest them. *The Home Visitor* is truly what it professes to be,—"Cheery reading for the home and the hearth." We know that it is a great favourite among young folk, and it well deserves to be so. While there is no lack of useful teaching, there are many quaint stories with a pointed moral which comes home to the heart and conscience. Mr. Power does not draw his bow at a venture, but has a distinct aim, and seldom fails to reach it.

Good and Bad Managers. By Ellen Barlee. London: Seeley. 1874.—Three excellent tales by Miss Barlee are comprised in this volume. They teem with shrewd and sensible advice, the result of extensive practical knowledge of the working classes, undertaken by the author in the most devoted spirit. It is quite refreshing to peruse them, so marked is the contrast between these most exact photographs (if we may be pardoned the expression), and what are often fancied to be the feelings and trials of the poor, as exhibited in ideal portraiture. It will be a most useful volume to circulate among the poor. They will read it with avidity for the interest of the tales; and in reading, may learn much that is most conducive to their comfort and profit. Much sound religious teaching is conveyed throughout.

Whispers from Fairy Land. By the Right Hon. E. H. Knatchbull-Hugessen, M.P. London: Longmans. 1875.—It is a curious system which in October, 1874, publishes a book as though in 1875, and it may hereafter lead to more perplexity in literary matters than was caused by Old Style and New Style formerly. It is not, however, of much moment in the case of Mr. Knatchbull-Hugesson's book, which is not destined to immortality. We have no wish to be needlessly uncomplimentary, but "three or four times we were in the thought that his fairies were not fairies at all;" or if they were, were quite as substantial as those who tormented Falstaff in Windsor forest, and on sundry occasions they express themselves in what has a very close resemblance to vulgarity. There is very little to commend in the manner in which the author has executed his task. The book "may not do harm, or teach evil lessons;" but this negative praise is quite as much as can be extended to it. In a volume of fairy tales, or indeed in any book that seeks approval, we look for more than mere harmless, and not over-refined nonsense.

Sir Evelyn's Charge, or, a Child's Influence. By M. I. A. London: Hunt. 1875.—A more than ordinarily attractive tale. It is of course romance rather than reality, as might be expected in what is

Digitized by Google

professedly a work of imagination. The story however is well told, and full of interest. The child Willy is like a silver thread running through it and connecting the various parts. To this we may add that the descriptions of country life in English manor-houses and country parsonages are presented in a very vivid and pleasing manner. We do not undertake to give any account of the story, which would be hardly fair to the writer. With our usual reservation as to how far devotion is stirred and morality strengthened by indulgence in fictitious literature, we may safely commend the book as a superior one of its class. It will be read by young people with probably more avidity than we would altogether approve; but there is much that is wholesome and Scriptural in its pages.

Soul Depths and Soul Heights. By Octavius Winslow, D.D. London: J. F. Shaw.—A very fruitful volume by that eminent minister of Christ, Dr. Octavius Winslow. It is an exposition of the 130th Psalm. Throughout it teems with holy thoughts and rich Christian experience. We have read it with much pleasure. It is remarkable that (with the exception of the learned treatise of Dr. John Owen) there should not be any other consecutive exposition of this most precious portion of God's Word beyond what has been supplied by commentators; for even among the Psalms it might have seemed most natural that one appealing so directly to the life-long feelings of the children of God should have been frequently and fully handled.

Life of Archbishop Whately. New Edition. London: Longmans. 1875.—In the year 1867 this book was the subject of a lengthened review in the *Christian Observer*. All the salient points in the Archbishop's distinguished career were fully and fairly dwelt upon. It would be needless, therefore, for us to go over them again, especially as this is the third edition of the book which has been called for. We will now observe that the contents are comprised in one handsome volume, and that the present edition is enriched with correspondence with Dr. Hawkins, the venerable Provost of Oriel, which enhances its value. As bearing on present controversies, we quote the account of the Archbishop's interview with Dr. Pusey at Brighton, in 1871. When the latter expressed a wish to preach in the Dublin diocese, the Archbishop told him he dreaded his introducing novelties. "Not novelties," replied the other. "Well, if you will, antiquities," said the Archbishop. As an instance, the practice was quoted of mixing water with the wine at the Communion. Dr. Pusey excused the practice by observing that at the early Communion complaints had been made that the wine affected the heads of the communicants. The result was that the Archbishop "fairly made him laugh." Perhaps it may be that the practice of turning the back on the congregation arises from incurable *mauvaise honte* on the part of the younger clergy, and that the desire for vestments may be to improve the condition of the Spitalfields weavers. We are glad, however, to find that Dr. Pusey could join in a hearty laugh at his own absurdity.

The King's Messengers.—The Distant Hills.—The Shadows of the Cross.—The Old Man's Home. By the Rev. William Adams, M.A.

Digitized by Google

London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1874.—These are neat reprints, with illustrations, of Mr. Adams' allegories, which with all their characteristic merits and defects have been long before the public, and have survived in the struggle for existence among publications of the class to which they belong. They were among the earlier and, we are bound to add, the more favourable publications of the early Tractarians. In scholarly tone and refinement, as also in moderation of doctrinal views, there is a marked contrast between these books and the outrageous extravagance which now finds favour among so many. We prefer ourselves other and sounder teaching, and so, too, probably, will most of our readers.

Bertram, or the Heir of Pendyne. By N. London: Nisbet. 1874.—A tale which will be read with great interest. The introductory portion of the story is laid in a part of Kent with which we happen to be familiar; and we can therefore indorse the accuracy of the writer in his, or her, descriptions of scenery which have been most carefully studied. This is in itself no small merit; for although the book professes to be a work of imagination, yet no real artist fails to have a ground-work of reality. Some of the most poetical descriptions in our language are almost servile reproductions of nature as it exists, in most faithful word painting. Perhaps this accuracy extends beyond the sylvan imagery, which is the theatre in which the characters display themselves; but we may not venture further in this direction. Anyhow it is a story which will be read with pleasure by those who are lovers of fiction. The interest is well sustained throughout; and if it is not a work directly for edification, yet there is nothing in it to harm or to offend: on the contrary, the aim throughout is to uphold what is true and right and commendable in the sight of God. We will not forestall the gratification of the reader by unfolding the plot; but we may fairly congratulate the author on a successful production.

The Forty Days of the Bible. By W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D., Dean of Cashel, etc.—Ministrations of Feeding the Flock of God. By Samuel Hayman, B.A., Prebendary of Cork. Dublin: Herbert. London: Simpkin and Marshall; Nisbet. 1874.—To the sister Church of Ireland we are indebted for these pleasant and profitable volumes. "The Forty Days" is the production of the accomplished Dean of Cashel, who both by pen and tongue has proved himself a most able advocate of Evangelical truth. In a series of addresses to his congregation, he has in a very profitable manner discussed some of the most remarkable periods of Forty Days recorded in Scripture, exhibiting in a marked way and definite order the dealings of God with man. Mr. Hayman is already well known as the author of some most useful works, marked by original thought. The present volume is unpretentious in character, but sensible and sound. We can augur well for the future of a Church where teaching of the character contained in these volumes forms the staple of instruction from her pulpits. There is in it an antidote for the bane which is afflicting Ireland.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

In the sphere of domestic politics Mr. Gladstone has again startled the nation by his resolute determination to withdraw himself into comparative retirement, and the pursuit of occupations more congenial to him than the excitement of ordinary public affairs. That the writings of the ancients will have a great charm for him may safely be predicted, but neither sleep nor indolence are likely to engross so active an intellect as his has ever been. There have not been wanting indications that this retirement was in contemplation; but Englishmen have been so long accustomed to see their great men die in harness, that this resolution of Mr. Gladstone partakes of the nature of a surprise. The Liberal party are now in want of a leader and of a policy. We hope that the interval of rest from political strife may be wisely employed in economic and social reforms, which are too often overlooked in the midst of party struggles. The condition of England is not yet perfect. Vice and misery, too often the fruit of irreligion, are yet only too painfully conspicuous.

Sad as the necessity has been, we note, with feelings of some satisfaction, that an effort has been made, by the stern enforcement of justice, to repress crimes of violence, which have become a scandal to our pretended civilization. It is God's decree, that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" and painful as the execution of it must ever be, better this than that brutal crime should revel unchecked, and innocent blood be poured out like water in our streets.

During the recent severe frosts there have been most frightful railway accidents, terrible in their destructiveness. The loss of life has been so appalling that we are not without hopes that there will be some intervention of the Legislature, enforcing additional precautions for the safety of the public.

In the absence of political excitement, there has been much interest aroused in a passage of arms which has occurred between Monsignor Capel and Canon Liddon. It has been the universal judgment even of those who most sympathize with him, that Dr. Liddon has been signally discomfited: his cause was a bad one, and his advocacy indifferent. What may have been the motives which induced the wily Romish ecclesiastic to proclaim, as it were on the house-tops so that all men should hear, that Ritualists are distinctively teaching Romish doctrine in its worst phases, we do not presume to determine. Now that Dr. Liddon's attention has been thus rudely called to it, he

Digitized by Google

intends to occupy himself in extirpating what he calls the *fungi* which his friends have been planting. When he has got rid of Romish doctrine, perhaps he will further busy himself with the extirpation of Romish ceremonial.

In France there have been two chief events of importance. In a message to the Assembly, Marshal Mac Mahon required the creation of a Second Chamber prior to the consideration of other measures. This was resisted by the Assembly, who demurred to the creation of a Senate until they knew what form of Government it would be required for. The result has been that the Marshal's Cabinet has resigned, and that there is every prospect of the dissolution of the Assembly, and a serious crisis in the affairs of the nation. The other important matter has been the opening of the new Opera House. Ever since the war the Parisians have been intent on two great building schemes,—one, the erection of an idolatrous temple on the heights of Montmartre to enshrine the latest superstitions of Romanism; the other has been this Opera House, consecrated to the foulest licentiousness. "Il y' a plus d'enfer ici que de ciel" (we quote from the *Guardian*) was the comment of a Frenchman in the midst of this "huge temple of pagan voluptuousness and sensuality." We regret that, even in the person of the Lord Mayor, England should have been represented in this shameful exhibition. Truly might it be said to France, in the language of the prophet, "In vain have I smitten your children: they received no correction."

There is apparently a lull in the commotions of Spain. The son of Queen Isabella has been accepted as King under the designation of Alphonso XII., and has entered upon the duties of his exalted station. His profligate mother, the especial favourite of the Pope, is not to accompany him. We are not sanguine of the stability of the new rule: it seems to augur ill for freedom of conscience and enlightment, which in the midst of all the confusion and anarchy which have prevailed, were yet making some feeble progress.

Lord Romilly and Ledru Rollin are among the dead.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limitted period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the reduced price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 3. MARCH. [1875.

EVANGELICAL PRINCIPLES.—CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

THE acts which are represented by these two terms constitute the ethical foundation of the restoration and worship of a sinner. Without them there can be no peace with God, and until they are fulfilled there can be no acceptable worship in His sight. The truths which they comprehend and the state which they indicate lie, therefore, at the very threshold of salvation; the substance of them is assumed in every religion and embodied in every creed, whether Jewish, Christian, or heathen. To have sinned is to need propitiation, an act of which these names are the practical expression and issue. It is unnecessary for us to point out how all this is confirmed in the ceremonial law and in the Gospel. They are parts, moreover, of one and the same thing, since the one must precede the other and can be of no avail without it, while the latter is the complement of the former.

There can be no controversy, therefore, between Christians on this general issue. Our differences begin only when we come to the question of mediation, and here must be our point of departure. All Christians believe in the propitiation of sin by the satisfaction of the death of Christ,—all confess the palmary article of the forgiveness of sins; but some profess themselves unable to realize or even to accept this latter fact, except through the special intervention of a human medium. Hence arises the very grave, and to every uneasy conscience momentous question: "Has God deputed to His Church any sacerdotal or ministerial medium through and by which the confession of sin may be made by the sinner, and the sinner receive absolution?" Nor, again, will there be any difference of opinion among all Christians, of whatever communion, that the confession of sin is primarily and principally due to God alone, and that offences against the

Digitized by Google

second table are offences in the first place against Him; nor, further, will they dispute the fact that to Him alone it appertaineth to forgive sins. Assuming these preliminary statements as admitted truths therefore, let us endeavour to ascertain how far the human element of mediation is possible, and how far the Church of England recognises it. In doing this we shall arrive at the real sentiments of the Evangelical body concerning these disputed elements of our worship.

Confession of sin, according to the requirements of the Gospel, embodies the following four particulars,—namely, an unreserved acknowledgment and specification of sin; a craving for pardon and restoration; an honest renunciation of the evil; and an appeal, through faith, to the promised mercy of God through the satisfaction of the death of Christ. The absence or defect of any one of these particulars destroys the value of the others, and vitiates the confession itself. There is, therefore, in the very nature of this transaction a secret condition which takes it out of the region of human cognizance, and consequently of any absolution which is other than precatory or conditional. This was the point seized upon by Luther in his "Treatise on the Keys." In the second chapter he introduces a dialogue between himself and a Romish priest:—

"Priest. He who has confessed his sins and done penance doubtless becomes absolved. We give absolution; but whether it be for you, that we leave to your consideration; for we cannot by any means find out how far your repentance is sincere: accordingly, we are uncertain whether the (loosing) key has applied or failed. It can easily fail.

L. Now am I thoroughly convinced that the key, in company with your absolution, is unsupported by the Word of the Almighty. I am to depend upon my penitence and my contrition, and not upon your key. If I am deeply humbled and do penance, then the key helps me to absolution; if not, all is lost, both absolution and money which I gave for it. But how can I be certain that I have rightly repented and that God is satisfied?

P. This I leave to your consideration: this I cannot know.

L. Again. What is it you give us in annual confession, which you have unmercifully forced upon the world, and which has cost us our bodies and souls, property and honour, without intermission?

P. What must we give you? Absolution.

L. Is it then quite sure?

P. Be you contrite, and our absolution stands registered in heaven: you are most assuredly pardoned. But if you are not contrite, then you are not absolved: for the key may err.

L. I hear it for the second time that the key depends upon my contrition and worthiness before the Almighty. This is all very fine. But how am I to ascertain that my contrition and amendment are sufficient in the Divine judgment?

Digitized by Google

P. I leave that to your consideration."

There is much more to the same purpose on the various points in which the power of the keys is exercised by the Church of Rome, the upshot of all which is that the state of the penitent's heart being known only to God, the absolution of the priest can be only conditional.

The late Mr. Hobart Seymour also says:—

"I asked 'whether the absolution by the priest had any efficacy in case the confessing person did not really and from the heart repent?' He replied, with some earnestness, that 'in such a case the absolution was null and void.'"

It will be seen from hence that the *certainty* of absolution, dependent as it is upon the actual embodiment of the four particulars above mentioned, is after all to be referred to the truth and faith of the penitent; and the oft repeated answer of Luther's "priest" is the only one that can be returned by any human medium whatsoever: "That must be left to your consideration." Hence it is that no sentence upon the part of any such medium can be other than conditional.

But surely there is yet a previous question to be settled as to the obligation to confess at all. The Romanists have as usual tortured and misinterpreted sundry passages of Scripture; but they even have never yet succeeded in showing that confession is to be made to a human medium. "Confess your faults one to another" does not mean "Confess to a priest," but that the man who has sinned against his neighbour is to go and tell him "I repent." And ingenious as the casuistry may be which turns the inquiry of a burdened conscience, as suggested by our Communion Exhortation, into a sacramental confession, it approaches so near to something like "deceitful handling" of a natural and plain method for obtaining counsel and relief, that I forbear to give it its true name.

Indeed, the two Exhortations themselves cut away the ground from under those who magnify sins after baptism into offences that either cannot be *certainly* purged, or can be purged only by human mediation and subjective penance, since the first exhorts even the blasphemer and the adulterer to repent, that so they may come holy and clean to the Holy Table, and the second appeals to grievous sinners to repent and amend, and be "partakers of this holy Communion."

But what is absolution? It is not the forgiveness of sins, but the declaration that sin is already forgiven by Him to whom alone it appertaineth to forgive. The reality of the absolution therefore is dependent upon His previous pardon, of which it

Digitized by Google

conveys only the assurance; but the pardon itself depends upon the actual faith and repentance of the individual who confesses. How far then does the Church of England recognise the human element of mediation, either in requiring confession or pronouncing absolution? That she requires public confession on the part of all who worship in her communion, and provides also a conditional and declaratory absolution for them, it is unnecessary to state. The only instance in which she deals with the individual, and the only special confession which she admits (and for which of course no form can be appointed), is that for which a conditional provision is made in her Office for the Visitation of the Sick. The following analysis of this Office in respect of the matters of confession and absolution is submitted to the candid consideration of the reader.

In the first place, it is *conditional*. "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, *if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.*" Where it must be noted that the examination and exhortation to confess are exceptional. For although the minister is directed to "examine whether he repent him truly of his sins," etc., etc., this examination (in the absence of any actual information) is optional, —namely, as the minister "shall see cause," and can only be, except on the foregoing reason, in *general* terms. If, in the course of such questions the minister happens to find that the sick person's conscience is troubled with any weighty matter, it is then his duty to move him to make a special confession in order to afford him that compassionate relief which he needs.

In the second place, it is *voluntary*, for the sick person can even then decline to confess.

In the third place, it is to be made *in the presence of others*, for the whole service (in harmony with all the occasional services of our Church) is arranged for united prayer.

Thus then while we have in the formularies of our Church three separate confessions: two of them in a specified form, and the third optional and conditional,—not one of them is required to be private. Indeed, the words which formerly included private confession in the Rubric before this absolution,—namely, "the same form shall be used in all private confessions," were expunged in the second Prayer-book, in 1552. More than this: while the first two are directed to God alone, the other is an acknowledgment to the Church of sins against the body, of which the minister, as his representative, at his earnest request absolves him. This the Collect immediately following intimates; for the priest is directed to pray (and this, although he has absolved the sick person): "Open Thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgive-

Digitized by Google

ness, and, as he putteth his full trust only in Thy mercy, impute not unto him his former sins."

I have said that the confession of the sick person is concerned with offences against the Church. This was the opinion of the Royal Commissioners at the Savoy Conference; for when the objectors required that the Form of Absolution in the Office for the Sick should be amended, so as to make it conditional, they replied:—

"The Form of Absolution in the Liturgy is more agreeable to the Scriptures than that which they desire: it being said in John xx., 'Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted;' not, 'whosesoever sins you *pronounce* remitted.' And *the condition need not to be expressed, being always necessarily understood.*"

In other words the Absolution in the Visitation Office comprehended, in the opinion of the Commissioners, such offences only as the Church is competent to deal with,—namely, offences against itself.

But if it be objected that "the weighty matter" which burdens the sick person's conscience may possibly relate to offences against the first table, it will still remain, and even with more force, that the absolution is conditional; for it will be observed that the preamble of this absolution is the same in principle with that of the daily service. In both the ministerial commission is formally and statutably declared. In other words, the preamble in the Visitation Office declares that a *conditional* power to absolve has been left to "*the Church*," of whom the minister is *pro tanto* the mouthpiece: a notable distinction, which points, as I submit, to the *character* of the offences which burden the sick person's conscience. Yet, even upon the admission that the minister is here exercising his commission in matters pertaining to the first table, it will follow that the authoritative words "I absolve thee," cannot exceed the latitude of the commission itself, which is here specially limited "to all sinners who truly repent and believe;" otherwise the two consecutive sentences would involve a theological contradiction. Further still, there must have been some reason for varying the opening formula of this absolution. For whereas in the daily service the words run, "Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc.; in the Visitation Office the preamble commences, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church," etc. Why this? If it be not that in this case the absolution is intended to deal with offences against the body of which He is the Authoritative Head, and His name is thus specially proclaimed to certify the sick person: *e.g.*, "To whom

Digitized by Google

ye forgive anything I forgive also; for if I forgive it, for your sakes forgive I it in the person of Christ."

As to the necessity of absolution, it is a question which no wounded conscience (and who that has examined himself by the law of God has not felt its reproach?) can dispute. For unless, and until, the sinner is assured of the Divine forgiveness he cannot know peace; and ought not, if he could. Hence the propriety of the daily-repeated second collect at evening prayer, as well as that of the twenty-first Sunday after Trinity. But what is to assure him? Is it the voice or dictum of a minister? Doubtless; provided he is commissioned with an express message, as Nathan was sent to David. But where is the minister who would venture to assume such a commission? unless we except the solitary priest who issues indulgences and fulminates damnation because he claims infallibility.[a] There is but one source out of which the Divine and healing touch can come, the Word of God. Hence the appropriate statement in the former of the two exhortations before the Holy Communion, which tells the penitent that "by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution." Hence also that further statement in the second part of the sermon on Repentance in the Homilies:—

"Let us use that kind of confession that God doth command in His Word; and then doubtless, as He is faithful and righteous, He will forgive us our sins, and then make us clean from all wickedness. I do not say but that if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, *or to some other godly man*, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand *the comfortable salve of God's Word*; but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins."

And what is this ministry and salve of God's Word but that clear array of precious promises scattered so profusely in both Testaments, but with greater precision in the New Testament, and summed up in that declaration of St. John, that "if we (truly) confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins"? This is the salve which the discreet minister, or other godly man, is to apply to the relief of the burdened conscience;

[a] Hooker's statement in Bk. vi. 1, on the comparison between the authorization of Nathan and that of Christ's ministers, must be itself compared with what he goes on to say in sections 3 and 5, as well as with the extracts given in this paper. The latter is general, not special, and, as he guards it, cannot "signify any other than only to pronounce of sinners according to that which may be gathered by outward signs; because really to effect the removal or continuance of sin in the soul of any offender is no priestly act, but a work which far exceedeth their ability."

Digitized by Google

and there is none other. The Lord's Supper, itself, or the most authoritative absolution must depend upon this Word for its assuring efficacy, because it is the foundation of all that we believe.

Yet, after all, there remains the personal act of faith, without which no declaration, on the part even of the minister, can bring peace to the troubled conscience. For until the promise is appropriated the peace cannot enter, and the trembling sinner is like one parched with thirst who refuses the cup presented to him. And here it is where the real difficulty for the most part lies. But for this slowness and reluctance to believe all that Christ and His Apostles have spoken, men would rarely need the extraneous help of a third person to determine their state before God. The simple declarations in the public services, and at the Holy Communion, would be sufficient, and the truly penitent would be filled with all joy and peace in believing; and sooner or later, if ever peace is to come at all, this must be the way to realize it. Nor can it be impressed too frequently upon the minds of those who are burdened with the sense of guilt that the assurance of the minister can convey no more certainty than that of the Word of God, since his authorization to absolve is nothing more than the application of its promises. On the other hand, faith alone can appropriate the promise of pardon; and the same faith which leads the penitent to seek and accept it at the mouth of man, would, if exercised towards God, bring a more real assurance, because the very dependence upon the second cause shows a defect in the simplicity and energy of faith.

To revert, therefore, to the special question, let us ask what mediation the Church of England recognises in the matter of absolution. There are but three forms provided in her Liturgy, each one of which is to be pronounced by the officiating minister. Two of these are declaratory and general; one is precatory, judicial, and special. It is of this last only that we need to speak. Now as the confession of the sick person is optional, and the absolution therefore only occasional, and is then supplemented by prayer for Divine pardon, it is evident that it contemplates offences against the body. For as absolution can only be conditional, or precatory, in relation to the Divine forgiveness, and is here partly judicial in form, and expressly in the name of the head of the Church, it can only comprehend such offences as the Church can deal with. Whereas, therefore, the minister, speaking in the name of God for the absolution of sins committed against His Divine Majesty, pronounces in a conditional sense, so here he speaks, first, in the name of Christ as the head of the body (and as such the final

Digitized by Google

judge) in a *precatory* form; and then, in the name of the Church, in an absolute and judicial one: *e.g.*, "Our Lord Jesus Christ forgive thee, and by His authority I absolve thee." It is evident from this that the communion of the sick person with the Church had been interrupted by those special sins which troubled him, since the officiating minister calls upon those present to pray that he may be continued in the unity of the Church. But there is more. This service concludes with a precatory exhortation, of which the aim and substance is, that by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ alone the sick person can obtain health and salvation. Why this, if not to direct the eye of the sick man to Christ alone? For it should not escape our notice that the Confession and Absolution of this service are parenthetical, because they are optional and occasional, whereas this is the regular closing portion of it. Now what is the rationale of these several absolutions? Is there any member of the Church of England who would venture to say that the absolution of any sinner is dependent upon the mediation of the minister? This were to neutralize the very essence of absolution, which is a declaration and confirmation of a pardon already bestowed. Very different was the opinion of Hooker:—

"We (of the Church of England) labour to instruct men in such sort that every soul which is wounded by sin may learn the way *how to cure itself;* they (the Romanists), clean contrary, would make all sores seem incurable unless the priests have a hand in it."

Again:—

"Shall absolution be a cause producing and working that effect *which is always brought forth without it,* and had *before absolution be thought of?* But when they, which are thus *beforehand pardoned of God,* shall come to be also assoiled of the priest, I would know what force his absolution hath in this case?

"Therefore, the further we wade the better we see it still appear that the priest doth never in absolution, no, *not so much as by way of service and ministry,* really, either forgive them, take away the uncleanness, or remove the punishments of sin; but if the party penitent doth come contrite he hath by their own grant absolution *before* absolution."

With this agrees the Romish Professor before mentioned. For when Mr. Seymour inquired whether it was not a revealed fact that the repentant sinner had the forgiveness of Jesus Christ promised to him, and given to him as soon as he repented of his sin? he answered, without any hesitation, that such was his belief. In saying which he did but agree with the Council of Trent, and Bellarmine, who speak to the same effect.

But let us hear what Dr. Marshall, who published a work

Digitized by Google

(reprinted in the Anglo-Catholic Library) on the "Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church," in 1714, says:—

"In her Office for the Visitation of the Sick, she hath indeed the indicative form, 'I absolve thee,' for the penitent's absolution; perhaps, in compassion to the great distress she supposed the penitent to be under, she might judge an extraordinary measure of comfort the fitter to be then applied to him.

"In the Office just cited our Church hath used both the forms, the one introductory to the other; the optative is first used: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, of His great mercy, forgive thee,' etc. And then follows the indicative: 'By His authority I absolve thee,' etc. So that in the one a pardon is begged for the penitent, and in the other applied to him.

"It looks as if our Church intended by this indicative form only the restoration of the penitent to her peace and communion, inasmuch as in the prayer subjoined to it a request is specially made that God would continue this sick member in the unity of the Church."

I hesitate to enlarge this paper with further quotations. But I must add one from Jeremy Taylor, whom no one will suspect of wishing to diminish ecclesiastical authority. In his treatise on "Ecclesiastical Penance" he avows two things; firstly, "that in the primitive Church there was no such thing as a judicial absolution of sins, used in any liturgy or church;" secondly, "that the absolution of sins, which in the later forms and usages of the Church is introduced, can be nothing but declarative," to which he adds, "if we would speak properly, and as things are in their own nature and institution, this declarative absolution is only an act of preaching." At the same time it is difficult to reconcile his view of the office for the sick *in this particular*, with other of his statements, nor can I assent to his gradation of the three confessions and their corresponding absolutions; since he appears to consider them as applicable to all the devout members of the Church; whereas the third is purely exceptional, and certainly not an advance upon the spiritual status of the worthy communicant.

But to conclude. What we say respecting ministerial absolution is that it is, firstly, a perpetual declaration of the cardinal doctrine of the forgiveness of sin through our Lord Jesus Christ; secondly, an assurance of the same to all who believe, repent, and confess their sins before God; and thirdly, that the two absolutions in the daily prayers and in the Communion Service are a sufficient provision for all who will in faith appropriate them. So thought Hooker:—

"What reason is there every man should not, under the general terms of confession, represent to himself his own particulars what-

Digitized by Google

soever, and adjoining thereunto that affection which a contrite spirit worketh, embrace to as full effect the words of Divine grace, as if the same were severally and particularly uttered with additions of prayers, imposition of hands, or all the ceremonies and solemnities that might be used for the strengthening of men's affiance in God's particular mercy towards *them*?

"If with us there be truth in the inward parts, the difference of general and particular forms in confession and absolution is not so material that any man's safety or ghostly good should depend upon it."

It would be well if we could return to the simple pretensions and practice of the primitive Church, and it is a misfortune that we should still be so far departed from it as to retain in our Ordinal that sentence which was never found in any single Church for the first 1,200 years, the passage from John xx.: "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Upon this sentence is the modern presumption built. Rome foisted it into her Ordinal 600 years ago, and we have, unhappily, retained it, though the Greek Church omits it. True that the words were intended on the part of our Reformers to apply to sins against the Church; but as long as there are men ready to exalt themselves by means of a supposed Divine commission to a position which their own gifts would not maintain, while others are willing to have their religion settled for them (to use a felicitous expression in Mr. Gladstone's recent pamphlet) "by power of attorney," we must expect the repetition of such discords as are now threatening to rend asunder the Church of England. Is a return to the pure and simple principles of the Apostolic age impossible? Have we as a branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church lost the spring of our youth and its *vis medicatrix*. So disastrous a thing we cannot admit, even though the leprosy of Rome has appeared on our surface. We cannot believe that the Holy Spirit is withdrawn, or that a jealous God will remove our candlestick out of its place. We will shun the sentence of Pergamos and Thyatira, and repent and do the first works. And so amid the coming convulsions of the European commonwealth we shall be kept by that Presence which shall be upon our Zion and her assemblies, "a cloud and smoke by day and the shining of a glaring fire by night."

WM. HARRISON.

NOTE.—I am induced to append this note to the foregoing paper, to point out that we cannot exact from human compositions what we are intitled to assume of those which are Divine: namely, radical completeness and consistency. All Divine truth must be fundamentally harmonious; but human compositions, which are of

Digitized by Google

necessity inferential, are subject to the partial comprehension of their composers. No one will predicate *inspiration* of the Prayer-book. At the best it is the inferential teaching of good and devout men. It is probable, therefore, that some readers may dissent from the foregoing interpretation of the Visitation Office. But whatever view they take of the Absolution, it must be one of two: *i.e.*, either conditional or judicial. If the former, it is in strict harmony with the other two forms: if the latter, it must relate only to offences against the second table, or it contradicts its own preamble.

Let me add the parallel form of Absolution used by the Romish Communion in this country, as given by Dr. Newman in his *Apologia*:—

"May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee. And by His authority I absolve thee from every bond of excommunication and interdict, *so far as is in my power*, and so far as you need. Therefore I absolve thee," etc.

They who would plead for more than this in our Visitation Office are surely "*ipsis Romanis Romaniores.*"

MEMOIR OF THE RIGHT REV. ROBERT DALY, D.D.

Memoir of the Right Rev. Robert Daly, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cashel. By Mrs. Hamilton Madden. London: Nisbet. 1875.

THERE is probably no institution containing within it most valuable elements for good, which has ever experienced such an untoward fate as the Church of Ireland from the period of the Reformation. For a very brief season Gospel light flashed from it into the midst of surrounding darkness, but it was fitful and uncertain. We know how little prepared the mass even of the English clergy, when first emerging from Romish superstition, were to proclaim the truth as it is in Jesus, with purity and effect. The existence of our Homilies is a mute but eloquent witness to their defects. What then must have been the case in Ireland, where the mass of the people were in a state of savage barbarism, revolting to contemplate? In the reign of James, when Ulster was planted, Presbyterianism confronted the Church; and ere long the two bodies, instead of making common cause against the common enemy, were engaged in internecine feuds, fomented by prelates, dignitaries, and rulers in whom the spirit of Laud fatally prevailed. Nowhere, not even in Scotland, was the Ecclesiastical policy of the Stuarts more disastrous than in unhappy Ireland. The strong constitution of Scotland, not without an effort, flung off the fatal *virus*, and though the Church

Digitized by Google

perished Protestantism did not: but it was not so in Ireland. There, upheld by the strong arm of power, the Church so far prevailed that it filled Presbyterianism with deadly hatred, and asserted for itself a barren supremacy which brought forth no fruits of spiritual life or progress. It was in vain that some few excellent prelates, such as Bishop Bedell, struggled against the formalism and corruption of the Church, and would have evangelized the people. It is amongst the woes of Ireland that High Church principles carried to extravagance were in the ascendant, at the period when of all others they were most likely to be injurious. Discord was engendered among Protestants, which not even more rational counsels and a more loving spirit has yet thoroughly healed.

Those who are only acquainted with the Irish Church in its more recent development, have perhaps a vague idea that the sentiments and opinions prevalent now always characterised Irish Churchmen. There could not be a more utter delusion. Until a century ago the Irish Bishops and clergy, so far as they had any religious views or party, were of the school of Laud, and were Jacobites with far more sympathy with the Pretender than with their lawful Monarch. Many of the chief dignitaries were little better than the highwaymen to whom Swift compared them, whose only object was plunder, and it is needless to reproduce the revolting descriptions of them which are readily accessible; but even the best were a discredit, and their religious policy was the ruin of the Protestant cause, so far as their power extended.

Some amount of sympathy and respect will always be felt for Scotch Episcopalians and for Nonjurors, even on the part of those who have the least sympathy with the narrow-minded prejudices which brought about their ruin. The halo of suffering was cast around them, and many no doubt were true sufferers for conscience sake, therefore to be treated with tenderness and consideration: but this element was wanting in Ireland. There was a rampant and offensive element of sacerdotalism blazing in vulgar prosperity, and conspicuous chiefly for simony, for grasping at pluralities, and for absenteeism when they had been clutched. It is much to the credit of George III. that he was conscious of this evil, and strove ineffectually to remedy it. It was with the first development of what are commonly called Low Church, or Evangelical views, a century ago, that the Church of Ireland ever fulfilled its object as a spiritual corporation established for the salvation of souls: gross scandals were abated, jobbing and corruption had had their day; and though many evils remained to be redressed, yet there was some hope for the future. She who had been so long asleep, drugged with potions of worldliness, began to awaken and to put on her beautiful garments, shaking herself

Digitized by Google

from the dust and loosing herself from the bands of her neck. Good tidings of good, salvation was published, and poor perishing souls began to experience the verifying influence of the Word of God; but it was ever the curse of the Church of Ireland to be thwarted by the State in her holy mission. Previously she had been employed as an instrument, not for the conversion but for the oppression of Romanism; and her revenues had been prostituted as political bribes to some of the most worthless of mankind,—if ecclesiastics who fulfilled no functions beyond drawing revenues out of Ireland, which were spent in England, can be deemed such. Now concession had taken the place of oppression, and a notable scheme was set on foot for the conversion of Ireland by a system of joint education, in which the power of the Word of God was whittled down till it hardly had an existence. When the Irish clergy—now awake to their responsibilities —refused to compromise themselves with a system of education all but secular, the powers of authority gathered against them, and their doom as an Establishment may be said to have been sealed.

We cannot undertake to recall here at length the *fiasco* which ensued: how gradually under the ever-increasing demands of Rome the faint semblance of Scriptural instruction vanished away, and the system of Government education in Ireland is now, not in theory, but in reality, a system in which all Romish superstition is freely inculcated and all Scriptural truth withheld. But the last days of the Irish Church as an Establishment were glorious days. Men of saintly virtue, of brilliant abilities, of untiring self-devotion, adorned her ranks, from her Archbishops to the humblest of her curates; and a power was exerted which made it manifest what a blessing she might have been to the nation if the commonest fair play had been extended to her. Nor will we yet despair. A system which has exhibited so much inherent vitality may yet be capable of noble efforts, if only it can be kept clear of the prevalent delusions of the day. It is not as a sacerdotal system, or as a Ritualistic system that the Church of Ireland will exert power, even if there were any efficacy in these things: the ground is preoccupied. No "Mass in masquerade" will supplant the mass in reality; no exhibition of clothes will outflaunt the gaudiness of Rome; nor will any assumption of priestly power match the audacious blasphemy endorsed by the Vatican. The medicine-man whom Cardinal Cullen can send forth is more potent than any conjuror whom Protestant ingenuity can furbish forth; but there is power residing in the Word of God, when in words and accents familiar to the heart of the Irish it is freely and fully proclaimed to them by faithful ministers of Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google

It was when the old bad times were waning away and new and better were about to be ushered in, that Robert Daly was born, in 1783, of an old and honourable Irish family. He was carefully brought up by an excellent mother, who was however unable to impart to him the best gifts, for she did not herself possess them till she received them through her son afterwards. It is characteristic of the times that it was at a ball he made arrangements about his ordination. His biographer says, that "He never spoke of any particular period as one that he could look back to as the time of his conversion to God. His awakening to a sense of the realities of religion seems to have been a gradual one; but every step that he gained in his Christian warfare he maintained manfully; and each doctrinal view of Divine truth, as he came to see it clearly, was put forth by him and preached with a power which brought conviction to his hearers." His first curacy was in the county Wexford, where he established Sunday schools, and formed classes for the instruction of apprentices and servants on the Sabbath day. He established here a reputation as a zealous, hard-working clergyman. It was unmistakably manifest, in Mr. Daly's case, that if any man will do God's will he shall know of the doctrine. Some most interesting extracts from his early journals are furnished, which might be perused with profit by young aspirants to the ministry. In his next curacy, in the county Wicklow, which was near his own home, he introduced into it family prayer, "which had not been thought of before, and was a very unusual practice at that time (1810)." As a specimen of the condition of the Irish Church even at so late a period, we may quote that Mr. Daly, riding one day with his Bishop, met a number of the clergy following the hounds. The only remark made by the Bishop was, that "they ought not to hunt in red coats."

About this time Mr. Daly joined the Bible Society, of which he became the secretary for the county Wicklow. In the year 1814, he was appointed to the living of Powerscourt, contrary to the wish of Lord Powerscourt, who at that time was not influenced by true religion, and was much prejudiced against him; so much so that he would not give him ground to build his house on the Powerscourt estate. Some five or six years afterwards a great change came over him; for to him and many other distinguished persons, including the Earl of Roden, Mr. Daly's ministry was singularly blessed.

Upon the details of his ministry at Powerscourt we cannot undertake to dwell, but must refer our readers to Mrs. Madden's pages, which furnish details of great interest to all who are spiritually minded: many valuable letters and profitable remarks will be found which will repay perusal. While he sedulously

Digitized by Google

watched over and edified his own people, he took an active part in every good work set on foot for the welfare of the Church in general. Not only the Bible Society, but the Irish Society, the Church Education Society, the Home Mission,—all were heartily promoted by him, and sometimes brought him into conflicts which he would gladly have avoided. His pen, too, was not idle in the pages of the *Christian Examiner*. Notwithstanding all his eminent qualifications, recommended by high birth, promotion in the Church came not his way. He continued for six-and-twenty years in his small country living, faithfully fulfilling his allotted round of duties. At length, in the person of Lord de Grey, a Lord-Lieutenant came to Ireland who claimed freedom in the disposition of Ecclesiastical patronage, and refused to employ it as an engine for forcing upon a reluctant Church a system to which they were conscientiously opposed. The large majority of the best men in Ireland had been studiously passed over, because they would not bow the knee to the system of national education which Government had set up: but at length the tide turned. The Deanery of St. Patrick's was vacant, and after a fierce struggle Mr. Daly was appointed to it. The same day the offer of the Bishopric of Cashel was made to him by the Lord-Lieutenant: he was consecrated to it in the month of February, 1843. With the See of Cashel was joined that of Waterford. Personally he would have preferred a residence at Cashel; but he "had a throat to cut," and the county of Tipperary was at that time much disturbed. What was of still more importance, the Protestant population of Waterford exceeded that of Cashel in the proportion of ten to one. A large sphere of usefulness was open before him, and much as he preferred the country in which he had always hitherto dwelt, he fixed his residence in the town: there he gave himself up to all good works. His munificence, although unostentatious, was of a princely character. He was indefatigable in the work of his diocese. During the famine he made it apparent, that in his charities there was no distinction between Protestants and Roman Catholics. At that time he took a district, and in person went from house to house with tickets for coal, meal, soup, or clothing. When they were loading him with blessings, he could not help telling them "he was just as good a Protestant as when he first came; and they called him Bob Daly." "Oh, your lordship, we were told lies of you, but now we have come to *know* you!" On the motion of one of the most influential Romish priests in the city, he was proposed as chairman of the Relief Committee; as it was a time "when an able, independent, and honest man should be at the helm." All this consisted with the most strenuous support on the Bishop's part with every Protestant effort for

Digitized by Google

the conversion of Ireland. Rome had not a more uncompromising antagonist, for neither by fear nor by favour could he be induced to swerve a hair's breadth from unceasing opposition to false doctrine. His whole career was one of increasing strife with what he deemed the fatal policy adopted by Government in the matter of national education.

For many consecutive years controversial sermons were delivered from the cathedral pulpit, in Lent; into which the Bishop threw his whole heart, preaching with amazing energy, but never with offensive asperity. It was no unmeaning answer which he gave to the Archbishop at his consecration, when he was asked, "Are you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to do the same?" The Church of Rome "had erred in matters of faith," and he testified against it. Some Bishops do not.

In all these respects, and in more than we can stay to enumerate, Bishop Daly was true to his heavenly Master. His life was prolonged to a great age. He was in his eightieth year before the weaknesses to which flesh is heir severely tried him; but he was still able up to the very last to take an active share in all public and official duties. At length, when he had overpassed his ninetieth year, the summons came which called him home, full of years and honour, regretted alike both by Protestants and Roman Catholics, "as a shock of corn cometh in his season."

There is an aspect of Mrs. Madden's book on which we have hardly touched, and that is the abundant matter for edification which will be found throughout in the correspondence of the Bishop and the description of his own spiritual life. It is a true remark which is made concerning him, that he had "a great capacity for heavenly things." To Christian people the career of one so eminent in spiritual attainments will prove an interesting and profitable study. We need only further add, that the biographer has done her part not only faithfully but effectively. The memoir is not overburdened with unprofitable details, which might readily have been accumulated; but enough are given to enable those who never were privileged even to have seen Bishop Daly to realize what he was, and how important a part he played in the regeneration of the Irish Church. There may have been prelates more learned, more brilliant, more mighty; but there were none to whom spiritually-minded Christians turned with more genuine interest and more thorough sympathy than to Robert Daly, the beloved and honoured Bishop of Waterford and Cashel.

Digitized by Google

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION.

Supernatural Religion: an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. In two vols. Fourth Edition. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1874.

THE title of this work does not convey to the reader any just idea of its nature or design. A work emanating from a firm of such world-wide reputation as that of Messrs. Longman, and entitled "An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation," would, in the case of the majority of those into whose hands it falls, be more likely to be regarded as an "Aid to Faith," than as a hand-book of Scepticism,—as an addition to our treasury of Christian evidences, rather than as an accumulation of historic doubts as to the truth of Christianity.

Nor is this ambiguity as to the nature and design of "Supernatural Religion" altogether removed by the perusal of the short preface which we find prefixed to it, or by the opening pages of the first volume. We are told in the preface that the work is "the result of many years of earnest and serious investigation; undertaken in the first instance for the regulation of personal belief, and now published as a contribution towards the establishment of truth in the minds of others who are seeking for it." Appeal is then made to the *alleged* words of "the great Teacher," enforcing the importance of a wise discrimination between the "gold of truth" and its "base counterfeits;" and the short-sighted policy of shrinking from the results of a fearless investigation of the claims of Christianity is enforced in terms to which the soundest upholders of the truth of Revelation have the least cause to take exception.

The same subject is continued in the opening portion of the first volume. In his Introduction, the writer exposes, in terms of just severity, the "thoughtless dexterity" with which many professed (and it may be not consciously insincere) upholders of the truth of Christianity seek to eliminate from it "every supernatural element which does not quite accord with current opinion." He alleges, with truth, that Christianity professes to be "a direct revelation of truths beyond the natural attainment of the human intellect." As such it appears to the writer,—and we heartily concur in the view which he here maintains,—that if the claims thus put forth are recognised, the doctrines propounded by the Christian revelation must be implicitly received, whether they do or do not commend themselves to the approval of human reason. If the credentials of the revelation be admitted, it follows, as a matter of necessity, that its doctrines must

Digitized by Google

be received by faith, not tried by the standard of human reason; if, on the other hand, its credentials cannot be established, then, as in the case of all other human systems of faith and morals, its contents become the legitimate subject of fair and impartial criticism.

The writer proceeds to announce his intention, in the work under review, to seek a conclusive answer to the momentous question, whether Christianity is, or is not, a supernatural Divine revelation? the right solution of which question he justly regards as one at all times of the highest importance, and, at the present stage of scientific inquiry and of Biblical criticism, as possessing, if possible, more than ordinary claims upon the attention of the mass of thoughtful and intelligent minds.

Having first expressed our entire concurrence with our author, both in his estimate of the momentous issue of a just solution of this great question, and also in his view of the groundlessness of the apprehension that the cause of truth will sustain any injury by the fullest and most searching investigation into the evidences of Christianity, we feel constrained to admit further the justice of his allegation, though we greatly deplore the necessity of making such a confession,—that the grounds on which a Divine revelation is defended by many orthodox Christians at the present day are either altogether untenable, or at least wholly inadequate. We have neither the time nor the inclination to verify our author's references to the writings of Dr. Irons and others of the same school of theological opinion, who, *if rightly represented by this writer*, deny that "the great doctrines of Ecclesiastical Christianity can be deduced from the Bible alone;" and rest their belief in the truth of revelation, not upon the strength of external and internal evidence; but rather upon "the sure basis of the inspiration of a Church which has little ground in history for any claim to infallibility."[a]

If by the term "Ecclesiastical Christianity"—a term to which we take strong exception, *in limine*, as ambiguous and misleading—be meant the Christianity of the New Testament, and if in reference to the great and fundamental doctrines of the faith as they have been received in the Church from the days of the Apostles downwards, as necessary to salvation, it be maintained either by Dr. Irons or by any others, that none of those doctrines "can be deduced from the Bible alone," we have nothing more to observe than that we altogether dissent from the truth of the assertion, as inconsistent, not only with the sixth of those Articles of Religion to which every minister of the English Church has solemnly expressed his assent, but,—which is of far higher im-

[a] Int., p. 17.

Digitized by Google

portance,—with the plain and express teaching of the Bible itself.

On the other hand, whilst we freely admit that there are some —not only amongst the taught, but also among the teachers— whose views respecting the evidences of the Christian faith are extremely vague and erroneous, we think that our author's description of orthodox Christians as consisting of two classes, of which "one professes to base the Church upon the Bible, and the other the Bible upon the Church," is justly open to objection; if, as is obviously the case, he designs to imply by this expression, that an undue amount of authority is necessarily ascribed by the one class to the Bible, and by the other to the Church. In one, and that a very important sense, the Bible is so far "based upon the Church,"—we merely quote our author's words, without endorsing the correctness of the phraseology,—that the Apostles, during their lifetime, and those who, after their decease, succeeded to the same *ministry*, though not to the same *office*, were Divinely appointed as the witnesses of the truth of the facts and of the doctrines of the Gospel; and that when those facts and doctrines were committed to writing by men whom the Holy Ghost inspired for that purpose, the Church,—meaning *generally* the entire congregation of faithful men, and more especially the appointed officers of the Church,—became the "witness" and the "keeper of holy writ."

In this sense, then, whilst we protest against the critical accuracy of the phraseology employed, it may be admitted that the Bible is based upon the Church; whilst on the other hand, in a larger and more comprehensive, though still not strictly accurate sense of the words, it may also be alleged that "the Church is based upon the Bible," if by this latter expression it be meant that the Church possesses no other authority than that for which Scriptural warrant can be adduced, and that the Church can impose no doctrines upon the acceptance of her members which are not expressly laid down in Scripture, or which may not be clearly proved thereby.

Strictly speaking, however, neither is the Church based upon the Bible, nor is the Bible based upon the Church. The Church of Christ is based upon the one foundation which apostles and prophets laid,—that is, Christ Jesus; and the Bible derives its authority from the fact that it contains that record of facts, of doctrines, and of rules of life, which holy men of God were moved by the Holy Ghost to commit to writing, for the perpetual instruction and direction of the faithful in all after ages; and of which the Church of Christ, alike in virtue of her Divine appointment and of the very necessity of the case, ever has been, and must ever continue to be the living witness and exponent.

Digitized by Google

Having thus cleared the way for the discussion of the momentous questions which are raised by the author of "Supernatural Religion," we proceed to express our entire concurrence with him in the belief that Christianity professes to be a religion supernatural in its origin and in its doctrines; and, further, that its claim to acceptance is based upon supernatural evidence. Nor can this position, in our judgment, be too clearly and too positively asserted in days in which, as our author justly alleges, there is a strong disposition on the part of many of the professed adherents of Christianity to draw a distinct line of demarcation between the ethics of the Gospel and the miracles which are not only interwoven into the Gospel history, but which form the very *substratum*, nay the very essence of Christianity itself.

Christianity, we repeat, is absolutely and essentially a supernatural religion. The facts of the Gospel history are inseparable from its doctrines; nay further, if we may so say, the facts in many instances are identical with the doctrines. Let but the facts of the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of Christ be admitted, and it is impossible for any to deny that Christianity is no cunningly devised fable, but that the Gospel is indeed the wisdom and power of God; on the other hand, let these facts be denied or reduced to the level of open questions, and the very foundations of Christianity are undermined, and whether the outward form of belief be preserved or not,—a cold and barren scepticism must speedily usurp its place.

Thus far then we find ourselves entirely in accord with the author of "Supernatural Religion;" and we approach the discussion of the great question whether Christianity is or is not established by such evidence as both he and we maintain can alone support its claims, with the expectation that a writer who has described so clearly and so justly both the nature and the importance of the question at issue, will be found an able exponent and advocate of the conclusions at which he has arrived. These conclusions, we deeply regret to state, may be briefly exhibited in the following terms:—

I. That all miracles are antecedently incredible.

II. That the evidence alleged in support of the Gospel miracles is altogether inadequate.

It has not unreasonably been objected to the mode of treatment of his subject adopted by the author of "Supernatural Religion," that if the thesis propounded in the former part of his work has been established, the second and third parts of the work, in which he deals with the evidence adduced in support of the synoptical Gospels and of that of St. John, are altogether superfluous: in other words, that if no amount of evidence can make miracles credible, it is lost labour to prove that the evidence

Digitized by Google

actually adduced is insufficient. In meeting this objection, as urged by Professor Lightfoot in his able article on "Supernatural Religion" in the December number of *The Contemporary Review*, the author, in his reply to that article in *The Fortnightly Review* of January, draws attention to the distinction between an argument designed to prove that miracles are "*antecedently* incredible" and an argument designed to prove that miracles are altogether "impossible." We think, however, that our author fails to meet the force of the Professor's objection. Had he contented himself with the attempt to prove that miracles are antecedently *improbable*, there would unquestionably have been ample scope left for his further attempt to prove the insufficiency of the evidence on which any alleged miracles are based. Had our author, however, succeeded in proving that miracles are not only antecedently *improbable* but also *incredible*, we agree with Dr. Lightfoot that his laboured attempts to prove the insufficiency of the evidence derived from the Canonical Gospels would have been altogether superfluous, if viewed in any other light than that of an admission, either that the result of his previous arguments was unsatisfactory to his own mind, or that those arguments would, in his judgment, fail to convince his readers.

Nor does the appeal to Mr. Mill appear to us to afford our author any support whatever in the establishment of the point for which it is made. Mr. Mill, in his "Three Essays on Religion," expresses his conviction that "a revelation cannot be proved Divine unless by external evidence; that is, by the exhibition of supernatural facts." He then proceeds to consider whether "it is possible to prove supernatural facts, and if it is, what evidence is required to prove them." As the result of this investigation Mr. Mill, in direct opposition to the views of the author of "Supernatural Religion," arrives at the conclusion or, to adopt our author's own account of the matter "decides *that it is possible to prove the occurrence of a supernatural fact if it actually occurred.*" The only question which remains for consideration, then, is this,—Is the occurrence of a supernatural fact so utterly impossible, in the judgment of Mr. Mill, that, whilst conceding the possibility of its proof "*if* it actually occurred," it must be deemed "antecedently incredible" until the time of its confessed occurrence, or its allegation under circumstances constituting a *primâ facie* presumption of its truth? Now it so happens that we have not far to go in quest of an answer to this inquiry, inasmuch as Mr. Mill in the same work to which the author of "Supernatural Religion" has appealed, expresses his opinion that "to the conception of the rational sceptic it remains a possibility that Christ actually was what He supposed Himself to be." It is no part of our present

Digitized by Google

design to discuss the question how far the acceptance of this possibility is or is not reconcilable with those views which Mr. Mill has maintained in his other writings. Our position is this. Mr. Mill affirms that to the conception of "the rational sceptic" —we leave it to the author of "Scriptural Religion" to accept or to disclaim the designation,—not only *a* supernatural fact, but *the greatest* of all supernatural facts is a possibility. Mr. Mill maintains further that if a supernatural fact actually occurred, that occurrence is susceptible of proof; and yet our author appeals to the authority of Mr. Mill in justification of the course which he has adopted, first, in showing that miracles are "antecedently incredible," and then—having succeeded, in his own estimation, in the establishment of this position,—in devoting three-fourths of his work to a proof that the evidence alleged in support of the Gospel miracles is insufficient to establish their reality.

If any doubt still remains in the minds of our readers as to the entire divergence of opinion on this subject between Mr. Mill and the author of "Supernatural Religion," we would refer them to a statement made by the former in his "Logic,"—and we do so the rather inasmuch as the passage is quoted by the latter in *general* corroboration of his own views, (i., p. 83), to the effect that in the case of anyone who believes the existence of a being possessed of supernatural power, but yet acknowledges that the government of the universe is, on the whole, carried on by general laws and not by special interpositions, the antecedent *improbability*, not incredibility of miraculous intervention, so far from being conclusive against the acceptance of a belief in such intervention, or from demanding that miraculous evidence of which the author of "Supernatural Religion" speaks as necessary to establish its reality, requires only "an extraordinary strength of antecedent probability derived from the special circumstances of the case." The moderation of Mr. Mill's demand for "an extraordinary strength of antecedent probability" in favour of miracles, affords a striking contrast to that of the author of "Supernatural Religion," who alleges that the evidence required to attest the miraculous evidence of a supernatural revelation must itself be also miraculous (i. p. 94).

We do not know whether our author has attempted to realize the full extent of this requirement. If he has, and if he is seriously of opinion that each one of the alleged Gospel miracles must itself be attested by another miracle in order to make it credible, and, further, if he thinks that he has established this necessity, we cease to wonder at his conclusion, that "supernatural evidence labours under the fatal disability of being antecedently incredible," and we only marvel that he has thought

Digitized by Google

it worth his while to devote three-fourths of the volumes before us to the altogether superfluous attempt to disprove the credibility of evidence which he had already shown to be "antecedently incredible."

The agreement or disagreement of the author of "Supernatural Religion" with Mr. Mill is, when viewed in and of itself, a matter of very trifling importance in its bearing upon the great subject with which the volumes before us deal. If, however, we have rightly comprehended and represented the drift of Mr. Mill's observations, the appeal which has been made to that pre-eminently able but unsound writer suggests one or other of two alternatives. If the writer of "Supernatural Religion" really believes that there is an essential agreement between the passages which he quotes from Mr. Mill and the views in support of which they are adduced, then it seems to follow that the critical acumen which has proved unequal to the discernment of the wide divergence already indicated is not likely to prove more successful in dealing with the intricacies of the great theme which is handled in these volumes. If, on the other hand, our author is of opinion that the very small amount of agreement between himself and Mr. Mill is of any essential service to his argument, it is not unreasonable to conclude that it is merely the extreme exigencies of the cause which he has espoused which have constrained him to have recourse to such aid; nor is it matter of wonder if the staff of the reed on which he has trusted has not only broken, but has also pierced the hand of him who leant upon it.

But whatever the merits or the defects of the subsidiary arguments and considerations adduced in these volumes, with a view to disprove the existence of miracles, there is a fatal objection, as it seems to us, to the method of treatment adopted by the writer, and one which presents an insuperable barrier to the attainment of any satisfactory results.

The whole question of the credibility of miracles turns upon the answer which has been returned to a previous question: viz., whether there is or is not a Personal Deity,—an eternal, self-existent, omnipotent God. So far then as concerns the argument of miracles, that argument "begins and ends," as Mr. Mozley has justly observed, "with an assumption." "We assume," he says, "the existence of a Personal Deity, prior to the proof of miracles in the religious sense." [b] Nor is it difficult to establish the justice of this observation. If the existence of a Personal Deity be denied, and God be identified, in accordance with the views now so unhappily prevalent, with Nature, it is

[b] Bampton Lectures, 1872, p. 74.

Digitized by Google

obvious to the dullest comprehension that the question of miracles is at once decided; inasmuch as to ascribe to the operation of Nature that which is supernatural is neither more nor less than a direct contradiction in terms. And if this be so, it surely behoved the author of "Supernatural Religion," not only to make up his own mind on this all-important question, but clearly and unequivocally to set before his readers the basis on which he proposed to discuss the credibility of miracles. It requires little discernment to see how anxiously he has endeavoured to escape the necessity of committing himself to any definite opinion on this preliminary question, and how eagerly he has endeavoured to evade this necessity, by the summary assertion that an argument for miracles, resting upon the assumption of the existence of a Personal Deity, is "not an argument at all." (p. 63.)

This assertion is one which is wholly unworthy of a writer who has undertaken to handle such a subject as "Supernatural Religion." We shall not now enter upon the question of the amount of weight to which arguments, whether *a priori* or *a posteriori*, in support of the being and attributes of the Deity are entitled. We are content to fall back upon the assertion of an inspired Apostle, that "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead;" so that even they are without excuse on whom the direct light of revelation has not yet dawned, if they deny the existence of a supreme First Cause. Our position, then, is this. The author of "Supernatural Religion" was bound, *in limine*,—if his design was to grapple fairly and fully with the argument of miracles,—either to concede that assumption, which, as Mr. Mozley has said, the argument for miracles, in the religious sense of the word, postulates; or, he should have avowed his disbelief of the truth of that assumption, and assigned his reasons for the conclusion at which he had arrived.

In point of fact he has adopted neither of these courses. He has attempted to grapple with the question of the antecedent credibility of miracles, leaving it an open question whether there is or is not a Personal Deity, omnipotent and omniscient. We submit that all that he has advanced on the latter of these suppositions is simply and absolutely irrelevant and worthless; for who would maintain the reality of miracles whilst denying the existence of a Personal God? Whilst, on the other hand, so long as he maintains that the existence of a Personal God is an open question, he evades the force of the irresistible argument, that He who in the beginning created, and who has ever since upheld all things by the word of His power, may, at any

Digitized by Google

moment, interrupt the apparent order of nature, and supersede that lower law with which we are, or think that we are, acquainted, by the introduction of a higher law of which we confessedly know—and can know—nothing.

We should complain of the course which the author of "Supernatural Religion" has pursued, had it been apparent that he really rejected all belief in the existence of a supreme Creator and Ruler of the world, and consequently that he had, so far, a right to argue the question of miracles on the supposition that "there is no God." We urge our objection with the greater confidence because we find that having held his creed in abeyance so long as he was arguing the question of miracles, and having strenuously denied the right of his opponents to an assumption, the admission of which would have seriously weakened, or rather destroyed the force of his arguments, he appears at the close of his work to shrink back in terror from the results of his own conclusions, and to be constrained to admit his conviction that there is indeed "a God that judgeth in the earth." [c]

If, then, these pages should meet the eye of any who have been shaken by the confident tone and by the assumed air of superiority to current opinions, and to so-called popular prejudice, which pervades the early portion of these volumes, we should advise such, before they proceed any further, to turn to the end of the second volume, and to examine the "conclusions" at which the author of "Supernatural Religion" has there arrived. He will find in those "conclusions" a recognition of "an omnipresent God, under whose beneficent government we know that all that is consistent with wise and omnipotent law is prospered and brought to perfection, and all that is opposed to Divine order is

[c] We are not disposed to modify this statement in consequence of the author's singular attempt to fasten a misconception of his views regarding "the Supreme Being," on Dr. Lightfoot, in his recent reply in the *Fortnightly*, to that able writer's criticism in the *Contemporary*. Our author complains (p. 24) that Dr. Lightfoot represents him as having studiously avoided, in the first portion of his work, to commit himself to "a belief in a universal Father as a moral Governor, or even as a personal God," and he grounds upon this complaint a surmise that the "Supernatural Religion," about which Dr. Lightfoot has been writing, cannot be his work. We naturally look for some proof of the incorrectness of the learned Professor's representation of the views of our author, and we find, to our utter amazement, that appeal is made to the chapter on "Anthropomorphic Divinity," in which the writer "studiously commits himself,"—we quote his own words, some of which we have put in italics,—"to *very decided disbelief in such a "Personal God" as he* (Professor Lightfoot) *means*." Such are the *ipsissima verba* by which the author of "Supernatural Religion" meets, and attempts to disprove the justice of Dr. Lightfoot's assertion that, in the early portion of his work, he studiously avoids committing himself to a belief "in a personal God." We leave it to our readers to decide whether the logic of the Cambridge Professor, or that of the author of "Supernatural Religion," is in fault.

Digitized by Google

mercifully frustrated and brought to naught." He will find there, further, an enforcement of the duty which devolves upon us to "apprehend as clearly as we may the laws by which the Supreme Being governs the universe." And, once more, he will there find a direct acknowledgment, not only of the wisdom and the beneficence of an omnipresent Ruler and Governor of the universe, but, further, a distinct acknowledgment of "a good providence which controls our slightest actions,"—in a word, "of an omnipresent immutable Power for which nothing is too great, nothing too insignificant, and in whose Divine order a fitting place is found for the lowest as well as for the highest in the palpitating life of the universe."

We venture, then, to express a confident belief that, in the conclusions at which the author of "Supernatural Religion" has arrived, when he came to consider his theme in the sober light of reflection rather than in the perplexed maze of controversy,—if he has not furnished a direct reply to the arguments which he has advanced against the credibility of miracles,—he has at least supplied materials which will blunt the sharpness of their edge. If God once interposed in a miraculous manner, and by His own Almighty *fiat* caused darkness to shine out of light, and made the things which were not to be, why, we ask, should it be deemed a thing incredible that He should again interpose in the order of the same universe, whilst continuing to uphold all things by the word of the same power? We admit, indeed, that it is "through faith" that we "understand that the world was framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things that do appear;" and hence it is that we are not careful to answer the inquiry whether by any process of strictly logical induction the being and attributes of God can be so established as to remove the possibility of doubt from the mind of the sceptic. Our argument is, that when these are admitted, the question of the antecedent credibility or incredibility of miracles is set at rest; and that the only question open for discussion is the conclusiveness or inconclusiveness of the evidence by which any alleged miracles are attested.

The objections raised by the author of "Supernatural Religion," on the ground that miracles may be and, as Christians believe, confessedly have been wrought by Satanic influence as well as by Divine, when cautiously and dispassionately examined, will be found, we think, to have but little bearing upon the main question at issue. It is easy indeed to create a different impression upon the minds of superficial readers by the sweeping assertions in which the writer of these volumes not unfrequently indulges,—assertions more remarkable for their shrewdness than for their profundity; and employed with an *ad captandum* levity,

Digitized by Google

which is altogether unsuitable to the subject of discussion. The following is an illustration of this propensity on the part of our author to meet a serious argument or assertion by a sneer in place of an answer. When replying to the objection, that if a miracle is nugatory on the side of one doctrine, it cannot have any cogency on the side of another, Canon Mozley very properly and truly observes that "a miracle is never without an argumentative force, although that force may be counterbalanced." Hence when a miracle is wrought in support of any doctrine contrary to the moral nature which has been divinely implanted within us, or in opposition to any of the fundamental principles of religion (as, *e.g.*, in support of idolatrous worship), we are constrained to assign to the miracle a secondary explanation; and to regard it not as an evidence of truth, but as a trial of our faith. At the same time, the first and natural explanation of a miracle is by no means sacrificed by such an admission. The exception does but prove the rule; and that rule stands, unless the exception be established. If this explanation appeared to the author of "Supernatural Religion" unsatisfactory, it was fully competent to him to expose its fallacy. We think, however, that the cause which he has espoused will not derive much confirmation in the estimate of reflecting minds, from arguments conceived in the style and tone adopted by the writer, when he presents Canon Mozley's answer to the objection we have named in the following terms,—"In other words, a miracle is always an argument, although it is often a bad one;" or when he follows up this representation of his opponent's meaning by the following reflection (the truth, however, of which we admit that the readers of "Supernatural Religion" will readily endorse),—"It is scarcely necessary to go to the supernatural for bad arguments."

It may indeed be fairly alleged, that when regarded as tests of the source of a supernatural revelation, miracles alone cannot decide the question whether that revelation is or is not from God. Holy Scripture directly recognises the fact that signs and wonders may be wrought by Satanic influence. It is very far, however, from following, as a necessary result of this admission, that "Satan has power to usurp that control over the laws of nature which is assumed as the prerogative of the Deity." On the contrary, the Bible teaches us to refer miraculous agency *ultimately* to God alone; and although He may at special times, and for special ends, permit the exercise of this agency on the part of subordinate creatures, whether human or angelic, such permission is very far indeed from involving in it the destruction of all evidential value in miracles, and is only suggestive of the necessity of caution and diligence in the inquiry whether the doctrine is, or is not of God.

Digitized by Google

Our author, here as elsewhere, perplexes both himself and his readers by failing to perceive, or by refusing to recognise, the wide distinction which exists between the ascription of miraculous agency, without restriction or limitation, to two independent and conflicting powers, and the ascription of miraculous agency ultimately to God alone, though, whether by command or by permission, exercised both by human and by angelic mediation; and exercised sometimes for good and sometimes for evil. Had the former of these alternatives received any support from Scripture, it might indeed have been alleged, as it is by the author of "Supernatural Religion" (i., p. 13), that it is impossible to argue with reason that miraculous phenomena are "at any time specially due to the intervention of the Deity." Inasmuch however as the limitation to which we have referred is clearly discernible in the accounts which Scripture contains of supernatural agency, as exercised by Satan, or by those who do his bidding, whether men or spirits, it is surely competent to the Christian apologist to recognise a limit which the delegated power of Satan is not able to exceed; and whilst freely allowing that "signs and lying wonders" are permitted to impose on those who "receive not the love of the truth," to maintain that there is a point at which the believer in miraculous intervention may say, with the idolatrous magicians of Egypt, "This is the finger of God."[d]

It must be borne in mind, moreover, by every calm and dispassionate inquirer, however it may serve the purpose of modern scepticism to ignore the consideration that the Gospel miracles are not presented to our belief as isolated and disconnected facts, but as the fulfilment of prophecies, delivered by a succession of writers belonging to different ages, and familiar to the minds of those who were the witnesses of the events which had been thus predicted.

Before we proceed to notice the second and third portions of

[d] Whilst abstaining from the expression of any positive opinion as to the natural or supernatural character of the imitations by the Egyptian magicians of the miracles of Moses, we may refer our readers to the explanation of the serpent "miracles" of the magicians, which is given by Mr. Cooper in his lecture on "The Corroborative Evidence of Old Testament History, from Egyptian and Assyrian Monuments," delivered at the request of "the Christian Evidence Society." It is as follows:—"A painting in the British Museum represents certain Egyptian priests carrying serpent-shaped sticks in their hands..... To this day, in India, the serpent-charmers possess the art, by pressure on the nape of the neck, of throwing the Naja, or speckled snake, into a rigid cataleptic position. Be it granted, then, that the Egyptian magi knew of a similar art four thousand years ago, as the Indians have for three thousand, and the whole mystery of the magician's enchantment becomes apparent; for the act of flinging the serpent on the ground would restore it to its original consciousness and vivacity."—"Faith and Free Thought," p. 224-5. 1872. Hodder and Stoughton.

Digitized by Google

"Supernatural Religion," we wish to direct the attention of our readers to a few of the rash assertions to which the writer has committed himself in the earlier part of his work, as affording some indication of the amount of caution which must be exercised in the reception of any of his statements, for which no specific authority is alleged.

In dealing with the alleged succession of ecclesiastical miracles, our author observes that "if we regard the miracles of Church history to be in the main real, the whole force of the Gospel miracles, as exceptional supernatural evidence of a Divine revelation, is annihilated." We have neither the space nor the disposition to enter upon the wide question thus opened; nor do we materially dissent from our author's conclusions in regarding a very large proportion of the alleged miracles of the fourth and later centuries as little more than idle legends, whether fraudently or ignorantly propounded and received. It must be remembered, however, that the author of "Supernatural Religion," in the paragraph which we have quoted, is writing argumentatively, not historically. It is true that he may plead the benefit of the qualifying term "exceptional," as affording some shadow of support to the sweeping assertion on which he has ventured. We think, however, that we shall not misrepresent the meaning of that assertion if we understand it as equivalent to a deliberate statement to the effect, that the continuity of miraculous agency in the Christian Church annihilates the value of the Gospel miracles as evidence of a supernatural revelation. An appeal to St. Mark xvi. 17 might be thought to demand not only a vindication of the canonical authority of the concluding verses of that Gospel, but also a more copious exposition of the words than our present limits will allow. We content ourselves, therefore, by challenging our author to adduce any justification whatever of an assertion which we meet with a direct and unequivocal denial; and whilst we purposely abstain from committing ourselves to any opinion as to the vexed question of the period of the cessation of miracles in the Church, we contend that it may be fairly argued, that the continuous following of signs, wherever the faith of Christ has been preached, and more particularly on occasion of its first proclamation,—if such signs can be established upon credible testimony,—so far from invalidating the evidence of the Gospel miracles, would tend rather to establish the identity, in its manifestations as well as in its nature, of that Divine power which has ever accompanied the Word preached.

Another of our author's confident assertions has reference to the subject of demoniacal possession. It is as follows:—"The theory of a demoniacal origin of disease has been entirely and for ever dispelled, and the host of miracles in connection with

Digitized by Google

it retrospectively exploded by the progress of science." We are, of course, well aware of the views of rationalistic expositors on this subject. We are aware, further, of the concessions which have been made by writers who still maintain the supernatural character of other portions of the Gospel narratives. We maintain, however,—and, we challenge the author of "Supernatural Religion" to disprove,—that the vast majority of our soundest expositors hold fast to the belief of the Church in all ages, that demoniacal possession is no mere form of mental insanity, or of disease subject to ordinary physiological laws; and that whether cases similar, in all the essential characteristics to those recorded in the Gospel (as Rhenius, the well-known Lutheran missionary, and, if Archbishop Trench is correctly informed, Esquirol,—than whom a higher authority could not be alleged,—have maintained), do or do not occur in the present day, and especially in those countries which are still in the undisturbed possession of Satan, the Gospel narratives of demoniacal possession are to be understood and interpreted in their plain, obvious, and literal signification; and that the evil spirits therein mentioned are to be regarded as altogether distinct from the beings which they inhabited, and as possessed of those characteristics which distinguish personal agents from physical diseases, or from moral influences.

A third and yet more startling assertion, advanced by our author, is contained in the following passage:—"Whilst the most uncritically zealous assertors of the antiquity of the Gospels never venture to date the earliest of them within a quarter of a century from the 'death' of Jesus, every tyro is aware that there is not a particle of evidence of the existence of our Gospels until very long after that interval." We should be sorry indeed to enter the lists with the author of "Supernatural Religion" on any question connected with a "tyro's" acquaintance with critical and theological subjects. It is quite possible that in the judgment of such, the space of about fifteen years may be regarded in the light of a "very long" period of time. If however the author of "Supernatural Religion" means seriously to affirm, that in the judgment of the best and ablest of orthodox theologians the three synoptical Gospels were not composed previously to the destruction of Jerusalem (an event which may be shown by internal evidence alone to have been future at the time of their composition), we will only say that his theological erudition is of a more rudimentary character than we had hitherto suspected; and that his claim to occupy a position in which he can rightly guage, and correctly represent, the extent of a "tyro's" acquaintance with the science of Biblical criticism, will be established on a footing which will not easily be shaken.

Digitized by Google

The most remarkable passage, which we have selected for quotation, remains to be adduced. At the close of that portion of his work in which our author deals with the question of the antecedent credibility, or incredibility of miracles, after alleging that "many of the profoundest critics and scholars of Germany, and of all other countries in Europe, who have turned their attention to Biblical subjects, have long ago rejected the miraculous elements of the Christian religion," he first propounds the amazing statement, that "the great mass of those who are competent to examine, and who have done so, altogether reject miracles," and then proceeds thus:—

"Such being the case, we necessarily revert to the first part of Dr. Mozley's representation, and find with him that it is no great result for miracles to accomplish, merely to be accepted by, and retain authority over a succession of ignorant and superstitious ages, 'because it is easy to satisfy those who do not inquire.'"

We are at a loss whether to admire more the ignorance or the presumption involved in these words. We will not now pause to inquire whether a witness to the reality of miracles more competent or more trustworthy than St. Paul has ever arisen upon the earth, neither will we now quote the long array of those early writers who were neither so unlearned nor so uninquiring as the author of "Supernatural Religion" is pleased to represent them. We are content to make our appeal to later ages, and to less rude and superstitious times; we will not even shelter ourselves beneath the reputation of names such as Bacon and Locke, such as Newton or Pascal; we are content to make our appeal to the confessedly enlightened nineteenth century, and to that period of it which can boast of writers such as Strauss, Ewald, and Renan, on the Continent, and such as Darwin, Huxley, and Tindal, in our own land; and we assert, without fear of successful contradiction on the part of those who are competent to pronounce an opinion on the subject, that whereas the theological and scientific theories of those able but fanciful writers are being successively shattered to the winds, the truth of revelation is being daily confirmed by the most irrefragable proofs, and is daily commanding the assent of the most thoughtful, patient and reflecting minds. So far, indeed, is the evidence for the reality of miracles from sufficing to satisfy those only "who do not inquire," that we affirm that an ever-growing conviction of the truth of a supernatural revelation, attested by supernatural evidence, is the special reward of candid, impartial, and humble inquiry; and that the promise still receives its fulfilment in the experience of those who thus search for the truth as for hid treasure: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

Digitized by Google

The purport of the second and third parts of "Supernatural Religion" is to "examine all the writings of the early Church," for traces of the Canonical Gospels; with the design to show that where those writings, whilst treating on subjects which would be assisted by reference to our Gospels, betray no knowledge of them, or actually quote passages from other sources, "the inference must be that our Gospels were either unknown, or not recognised as works of any authority at the time." The second part is occupied with an examination of the evidence for the three synoptics, and the third part with that of the testimony regarding the fourth Gospel.

It is obvious that an examination in detail of the contents of these portions of "Supernatural Religion" would involve us in a discussion, the length of which would far exceed the limits of a single article: such examination, moreover, is the less needful, inasmuch as it has been already accomplished in part, and is now being carried on by the pen of a scholar and theologian so eminently qualified for such an undertaking, as is Professor Lightfoot. The utmost which we purpose to accomplish by the brief notice which we shall take of these portions of the work, is to expose the shallowness of the principles which our author has adopted, and the unsatisfactory character of the results at which he has arrived.

Assuming then, for a moment, that our author has succeeded in establishing both the silence of some of the earliest Christian writers as to the existence of one or more of the Canonical Gospels, and also the fact that their quotations are made generally, or even universally, from other sources, when we should have expected quotations from or allusions to the Canonical Gospels, it is important to observe,—first, that this silence may, in some cases, admit of an explanation very different from that which the author of "Supernatural Religion" has assigned to it; and secondly, that those other sources, to which allusion is made, may afford conclusive evidence of the notoriety and general reception of the great facts of the Gospel history,—inclusive of its miracles,—the truth of which it is the object of the volumes under consideration to disprove.

For example, as regards the former of these two points, it is possible, had the author of "Supernatural Religion" been more thoroughly conversant with his subject, that he would have been aware that that silence of Eusebius, on which he is so eloquent on the subject of the fourth Gospel, so far from being a witness against its canonicity is rather an argument,—and, under all the circumstances of the case, as Dr. Lightfoot has shown, a very powerful argument on the opposite side. It is to Eusebius, as is well known, that we are indebted for almost all that we

Digitized by Google

know of the lost ecclesiastical literature of the second century. The argument of the author of "Supernatural Religion" is, that where Eusebius does not mention the allusion of any one of these lost writings to any canonical book, no such allusion was contained in it. There is a singular simplicity in this argument which is better met by illustration than by formal refutation.

We will suppose that A, a friend of our own, is relating to us his casual meeting with B, a friend who had just returned from Madrid, and that in the course of A's allusion to the subject of his conversation with B, no allusion is made by A to the recent entrance into his capital of the youthful Sovereign of that country, as having been witnessed, or referred to by B. We will suppose that we, on the strength of this silence, assert our grave historic doubts as to the fact that such an entrance into Madrid has been made by King Alfonso, and that when challenged to vindicate our incredulity, we refer to the fact that A, who had just met B, who had recently returned from Spain, did not mention to us the fact that B had seen or heard of the occurrence. We are by no means certain that the author of "Supernatural Religion" would be altogether convinced on the strength of this reticence on the part of A, that the accounts which he had read in the daily papers were altogether fictitious; and we think that a doubt at least would arise in his mind whether B might not possibly have seen or heard that which he had not happened to relate to A, or whether A might not have failed to repeat to us what he had heard from B. And yet, on the strength of the silence of Eusebius as to any testimony to one or more of the canonical Gospels in the writings of Hegesippus, of Papias, and of Dionysius of Corinth, our author thinks it safe to assume that no such reference existed in the books which they wrote. We will only add that Dr. Lightfoot has proved,—as regards the writings ascribed, whether correctly or incorrectly, to Ignatius and to Polycarp, and also as regards those of Justin Martyr, and Theophilus of Antioch, —that this silence of Eusebius as to the existence of passages which are found in these writings, and which bear upon the determination of the canon of the New Testament, is a matter of fact, not of conjecture. The learned professor proposes an inquiry to which the author of "Supernatural Religion" will probably have some difficulty in returning an answer, when he asks, "What is the value of a principle which, when applied in a simple case, leads to conclusions diametrically opposed to historical facts?"

There is a further oversight in the argument of the author of "Supernatural Religion" which, we think, affects even more seriously his conclusions. It does not seem to have occurred to

Digitized by Google

the mind of the writer that this silence of Eusebius, to which he attaches so much importance, may have been, in some cases, not accidental, but designed; and, further, that the legitimate inference to be drawn from this silence may, in some of these cases, be precisely the reverse of that at which the author of "Supernatural Religion" has arrived.

Now Dr. Lightfoot has shown, in his very able article in the January *Contemporary*, to which we have already referred, that such is the legitimate inference to be drawn from the silence of Eusebius respecting early witnesses to the canonicity of the fourth Gospel. "The Apostolical authority of that Gospel," as Professor Lightfoot well observes, "had never been questioned by any Church writer from the beginning, so far as Eusebius was aware, and therefore it was superfluous to call witnesses." This assertion does not rest, like so many of the assertions in the volumes before us, upon the mere authority of the writer, though even in that case it would have carried much weight with those who are acquainted with Dr. Lightfoot's writings. It is substantiated by reference to the professed design of Eusebius, which was to establish the authority of those writings *whose authority was called in question*, not those concerning which no doubt had ever existed in the Church. It is thus that we find him, as Dr. Lightfoot reminds his readers, alleging repeated testimonies to the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which had been called in question, whilst he observes a strict silence concerning the universally acknowledged Epistles of St. Paul, such as those to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. It is thus, again, as the same writer has remarked, that he makes no mention of a distinct testimony which is found in Theophilus of Antioch to the Gospel of St. John, whilst he mentions the reference which is made by the same author to the Apocalypse.

We have already exceeded our proposed limits; and we are consequently unable, at the present time, to do more than allude, in the most cursory manner, to the attack which our author has made upon the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel. The subject itself is one not only of deep interest, but, at the present time, of more than ordinary importance. We trust, at no distant period, to be able to revert to it,—whether in a continuation of our review on "Supernatural Religion," or in connection with other works which have long demanded notice on the same topic. We take our leave, for the present, of a book which we fear will be productive of much mischief. It is a book which exhibits the results of considerable learning (or perhaps we should rather say, of extensive reading), and of no inconsiderable amount of ability. To superficial readers it will present the

Digitized by Google

charms of novelty; and to unwary readers, the attractions of apparent candour and impartiality. We advise none, therefore, to read it who do not possess both the ability and the opportunity to examine it carefully and to test it thoroughly. Such will find that its bold and startling allegations will melt away before calm and deliberate investigation: and if (as we freely allow will probably be the case) they find that some of the assertions made by the apologists for Christianity will not bear the test of impartial scrutiny, and that some of the admissions of the defenders of revelation are fraught with imminent danger to the citadel of which they profess to be the guardians, they will find also that the assaults of its assailants are, for the most part, far less to be apprehended than the superficial defences of its friends; and whilst the one, as well as the other, may be destined to "wither" and to "fall away" like the grass, the "foundation of God standeth sure," and "the word of the Lord endureth for ever."

CORNWALL IN ITS RELIGIOUS ASPECT.

THE place fixed upon for our autumn excursion last year was a small fishing port on the south coast of Cornwall. On a brilliant Saturday afternoon we quitted the railway to drive about ten or twelve miles to our unknown home. Entire strangers to the country, our knowledge of the people among whom we were about to tarry was limited very much to impressions derived from our boyish readings of Cornish wreckers, and of the "thirty thousand underground," who stood up so boldly for the life of one who claimed the sympathy which the prefix of "Tre, Pol, or Pen" was sure to excite in Cornish hearts. A friend who had preceded us had secured rooms in a small cottage, where we were prepared to find ourselves among a friendly but somewhat rough and primitive people, in a place where endless subjects for the pencil, and perfect freedom, were to compensate the comforts and restraints of an established watering place.

The drive was thoroughly delightful. At that season of the year, and under the effects of a bright sun rapidly declining, even the most open lands of Cornwall, gay with heather and gorse, were beautiful. The roads, excellent in themselves, were bounded by banks wonderfully rich in ferns and wild flowers. As we descended from the higher and treeless land of the interior, some fine plantations clothed the more sheltered ravines; and finally the sea, blue as the Mediterranean, came in view, just as the sun had dipped below the horizon. A more lovely autumnal evening never welcomed travellers to a new home.

Digitized by Google

During what remained of daylight, and by the light of a moon nearly full, we were able before retiring to rest to form a tolerably clear idea of the place to which we had come, and to make the acquaintance of the stout, active, pleasant and kindly body who owned the small cottage to which we were introduced.

The cottage stood on a cliff among a cluster of fishermen's cabins, and was in fact little more than one of the same class, with the added dignity of an upper story. One house of somewhat greater pretension, and universally spoken of as "the big house," stood near. With this exception the occupation of the neighbours was generally manifest by the blue jerseys hanging out to dry, and the spars and tackle, lobster pots and fishing nets, which surrounded the dwellings. There could be no want of subjects for the pencil here. Looking from the cliff to the eastward the bold headland of the Lizard, to the westward that of Land's End, formed a noble bay, the centre of which was flooded with the light of the moon. Both the Lizard Head and Land's End were hidden by nearer projections, and their lights were consequently concealed; but numerous vessels which had either just lost the Lizard light on their outward voyage, or were hailing this well-known welcome to old England homeward, passed across the moon's reflection. Below, at the embouchure of a small river which had worn its way through the cliffs, lay what had till lately been a small fishing village, but which skill and enterprise are converting into an active little town, with a small harbour protected by a masonry pier. The entrance to this refuge is a narrow passage through reefs of the dark jagged rocks, which every fall of the tide exposes to view along this terrible coast. The harbour is therefore only adapted to the fishing craft of the place and to coasting vessels of the smaller class. Being Saturday evening the former were lying snugly within the inner harbour. The sea was so tranquil that there was hardly a ripple against the pier head, and only a slight white line marked the run of the coast.

We retired to rest satisfied that the scenery around us was to realize all our anticipations, and rose to take our second view of the place under the influence of a bright Sunday morning. A road scarped in the slaty rock of the cliff led down to the little harbour, where the ebb tide had stranded a whole fleet of small vessels in all the picturesque attitudes which they then assume: a more perfect picture of Sabbath rest could hardly be seen. There was not a sign of toil or labour, and hardly a sound to be heard. The nets hung idly on the masts, and the two or three sailors who were there showed by their clean blue jerseys and well blackened boots that they were dressed for church or meeting.

Digitized by Google

With one of these, an elderly man, we entered into conversation, commencing it by some request for information as to the places of public worship and the hours of the services of the day. Our friend was a Wesleyan; and from him and from other sources, our landlady among others, we learnt that the Methodists formed by far the larger portion of the community, the remainder being divided between the Church of England and the sect called "Bible Christians;" and we may at once state that the object of this paper is to give a plain and simple narrative of the aspect under which these forms of Christian organization presented themselves to a casual visitor to this remote portion of the kingdom, and among a plain and simple people.

Being ourselves loyal and loving members of the Church of England our first inquiries were naturally directed to ascertaining where we could worship God in the manner to which we had been all our lives accustomed. If there was a spot to which our beautiful Service in its simplest form would appear to be peculiarly appropriate, it was here among this simple, hard working people. It might have been hoped that the innovations which had been distracting other congregations, had as yet left this secluded spot untouched, and that the service of our Church would have been performed here in the manner to which from our childhood we had been accustomed. It was, therefore, with a feeling of disappointment that we received the information, which our non-conforming friends gave, and which other sources of information confirmed, that the church was said to be "very high." This was almost invariably accompanied by expressions of respect and regard for the incumbent as a neighbour and clergyman.

Resolving, of course, not to be influenced by mere report, but to judge for ourselves, we repaired at the usual hour to the church; and we shall state as exactly as we are able the form in which the service of the Reformed Church here presented itself to us.

The building was a new one, as the parish or district had only lately been detached from the mother church, situated at a distance of three miles. It was of suitable size and of simple ecclesiastical style, with a neat school and good parsonage-house near at hand; but on entering it was visible at once that our informants had not been mistaken in saying that it was "very high." Facing us was what we suppose would be called by Ritualists the high altar; upon this stood a gilt cross in the centre, with vases of flowers and candlesticks on each side. Immediately over what ought to have been the communion table was a small window, in which the crucifix was prominently represented in a transparency of stained glass. Thus while the

Digitized by Google

letter of the law which prohibits the use of the crucifix on the communion table was unbroken, all that the law was intended to prohibit was accomplished. On the wall, between the table and this window, was a red curtain, running on rings: it was drawn aside on each side, so as to leave the space over the table exposed. This space was occupied by either paper or fresco with a gilt pattern. It looked like a space where a picture ought to be; but no picture was there, and what was the meaning of the curtains we could not discern. On each side of the altar, as we must again call it, was a wooden pedestal bearing an equilateral triangle, upon the apex and two sides of which were seven candles. These pedestals were placed so near to the table that the lights, without being on it, would have very much the same effect as if they were; and we suppose would have all the effect which the law against their use was intended to prevent. In all there were twenty-eight candles within the precincts of the communion rails.

The centre of the building was occupied by the school children, —boys and girls sitting separately. A very sparse congregation occupied the seats on each side.

We had scarcely completed our observations when the organ sounded, and the congregation rose (except ourselves, who have been accustomed in the house of God to pay this act of reverence to God alone). Twenty surpliced celebrants,—ten of whom were adults, and ten boys,—filed in, and took their places. At the head of these was a young deacon, officiating in the absence of the incumbent. He wore over one shoulder a broad green ribband like a gigantic book-marker. Having never seen anything of the kind before in an English Church, we were told, in reply to inquiries, that it was called a "stole." It was curious to see one of those things, of which we had heard so much, for the sake of which some parties are willing even to bring dissension into the Church of Christ.

The prayers were of course intoned, and the Psalms chanted. the lessons were announced by the deacon, but read by one of the adult members of the choir. At the close of each the words "here endeth the first (or second) lesson," were pronounced not by the reader, but by the deacon. When the time for reading the Litany came, the deacon leaving the reading-desk knelt at a small prie-dieu in front of the altar, having his back to the congregation and his hands raised in attitude of supplication towards the altar. The whole was intoned and the responses made by the choir. At the close of the Litany the school children were marched out of the church, and the sermon immediately followed. No portion of the Communion service was read: we conclude because there had been early celebration.

Digitized by Google

The preacher, being the same deacon, ascended the pulpit, and turning his back to the congregation and his face to the east (in this case to a dead wall), pronounced the words,—"In the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." If he did not cross himself his movements had so much the appearance of it that we, and those with us, mistakingly thought he did.

Of the sermon nothing particular needs to be remarked, except that it was the only portion of the whole service that could possibly, in our opinion, have been either profitable or intelligible to the children who were withdrawn just before it commenced. In saying this we hardly except even the lessons of the day, on account of the manner in which they were read. The natural result followed; and though used to find small children inattentive and troublesome, any so inattentive and so troublesome as these we never saw.

When these poor little things (sixty in number) were released, we found that the congregation consisted of forty persons,—inclusive of a party of six strangers. Of these there were few whom we could suppose to be the parents of the school children.

Such was the form in which the service of the Church of England was presented. We certainly left the church with very painful feelings. It was painful to think of the state of mind that could lead educated Englishmen to seek means of keeping the letter of the law by which they were bound, while breaking the spirit of it; and there was a feeling that we were personally wronged. As Englishmen we had a right to find the means of worshipping God according to the forms of the Church of England as by law established, even in this secluded and remote part of the kingdom, and we were defrauded.

For those who dissent from the doctrines and teachings of our Church, and acting upon their convictions separate themselves from it, we have the highest respect; but for those who avail themselves of their position in its ranks to subvert its teachings, our feelings are very different. Certainly the service was not that of the Church of England.

Seeing then the place wholly given up to dissent, in one direction or another, and deprived virtually of the ministration of our own simple form of worship, we resolved that we would at any rate judge for ourselves as to the condition of the non-conforming bodies in the place, and for the first time in our lives we joined the congregation which in the evening was flocking to the Methodist chapel.

As we approached the chapel we were quickly recognised as strangers, and seats in a gallery pew were politely offered. The building, which was plain, was capable of holding perhaps 300 people. It was soon filled with a most respectable congregation.

Digitized by Google

What was particularly remarkable was the large proportion of men,—and men of the working class; in this case, of course, principally fishermen. Many of these, weather-beaten, hardy-looking men, with their children and grandchildren by their sides, the little girls tidily dressed, were marked by their blue jerseys. The children, influenced by the presence and example of their parents, were remarkably well behaved. Two or three who had come alone, and showed some symptoms of levity, were brought to order by the rebuke of a respectable elderly widow in a neighbouring pew.

A choir formed of men and women was placed behind the pulpit: a young person, the daughter of the village grocer, presiding at the harmonium.

The service, which was of course according to the Presbyterian form, was conducted by a young man in plain clothes. It was throughout earnest and hearty, and could be thoroughly "understanded of the common people." The music was good, but not too artistic for the hymns to be joined in by the whole congregation; while a voluntary by the choir alone was pleasingly executed. If there were some things in the style and language and energy of the preacher difficult to reconcile with good taste and the niceties of the English language, the sermon was earnest and heart-searching, and evidently suited to the feelings and capacities of the hearers, and was good plain gospel.

We were naturally desirous to learn who was the preacher, and before quitting the chapel obtained some information from our neighbour to whom we were indebted for our seats. Was he their regular minister? No. Was he preparing for the ministry? No. Did he belong to the place? He was a young farmer of the neighbourhood. Our friend was evidentally unaware of the depth of our ignorance in regard to the organization of the Methodist body, and was less communicative than we wished; but subsequent inquiries, especially from a most respectable farmer's wife, from whom we purchased our supplies of poultry and new laid eggs and butter, and the delicious clouted cream of the country, afforded us more information. As she had observed us in the chapel, at our visit the following day the conversation naturally turned on the subject of the service of the day before, and we learned that the young man was one of a body called "local preachers." As we understood her, there were in this district as many as forty of this body: men who offer themselves to assist in the ministry of God's Word, without quitting their secular employments for the ordained ministry. If approved and accepted by the elders, or whatever is the proper local authority, they are appointed to assist the minister in supplying the needs of the numerous chapels of his district. Every three

Digitized by Google

months they are "planned," as our informant expressed it, or told off, to fill the various pulpits for each Sunday of the quarter. Not only are *they* thus "planned" to itinerate through the district, but in each congregation the various members of it are "planned" to afford hospitality, in due rotation, to the itinerant preacher. "Thus," added our informant, "it was our 'plan' yesterday, but the preacher had other friends to whom he wished to go." We could now understand how the small meeting-houses, which we saw scattered all over the country, wherever there was even a cluster of a few cottages, could be supplied with a ministry every Sunday of the year.

We left the place of worship that evening with a very friendly feeling towards our Non-conformist brethren. We do not say that there were not things which strengthened our affection for our beautiful liturgy and service, but we left in admiration of the work which Wesley had achieved among this hardy people, and with a strong impression that our Church might take valuable lessons from our neighbours towards the solution of the great question,—how to bring religion to bear upon the masses of the people? how to bring the working classes to hear the Word of God?

The Bible Christians, though less numerous than the Methodists must number nevertheless a considerable portion of the population, judging from the size of their meeting-house. This sect is, it appears, an off-shoot from the Wesleyans, from whom, we were informed, they differ but little in discipline, and not at all in doctrine. That a good feeling exists between the two bodies was evinced by the announcement in the Wesleyan chapel of services to be held in that of the Bible Christians. One of the meetings of these brethren was to have taken place on a week-day evening, but as all the fishing boats were at sea after the pilchards, the meeting could not be held. There could not have been a more distinct proof of the rank of those who constitute this body, but we had not the opportunity of forming any further acquaintance with them than was afforded by a conversation with a pleasing young man and his wife, who had charge of the chapel, and held a leading position among them. We did not bring away any data as to the origin, extent, or organization of the sect sufficiently accurate to be of any value.

On the following Sunday, much against what would have been our wish and desire, we were again among the congregation at the Wesleyan chapel, and again heard the Gospel of Christ faithfully proclaimed and sin forcibly denounced; and as our stay at the place was sufficiently long, it is but right to state that we have never seen a community among which religion appeared to have a more permeating practical effect.

Digitized by Google

Among many indications of this, one of the most striking was the strict observance of the Sabbath. On that day none of the fishing boats left the harbour. The Saturday afternoon was passed in cleaning and mending the nets and tackle; the Sunday was a day of rest.

The next feature which attracted the notice of the visitors was the habit of sobriety. In a place numbering a population of about two thousand we only saw one small public-house, and that a place of refreshment near the quay. All our inquiries led to the assurance that drunkenness was a crime of rare occurrence, and reprobated by the public feeling of the community. The consequences were very perceptible: there was not a policeman in the place; the people had all the appearance of being well-to-do. From cottages and cabins, built of the rough untrimmed slate of the country, which in other parts of England would be supposed to be the abode of poverty, families emerged neatly dressed and with all the appearance of comfort and respectability. More than this; their cottages, themselves the memorials of an age of less advanced civilization, were being rapidly supplanted by substantial houses of worked stone and slated roofs. There was on all sides an air of progress and improvement.

Nearly all the fishing boats were the property of the fishermen themselves. Conversing with a boat builder, who had one of these small craft on the stocks, we were informed that the price of the vessel, as it left his hands, would be £25, but that would be without the iron work; this would be about £7 more; and when the masts, rigging and sails were added the whole cost would be about £50. The sailors themselves, he said, were his customers, and from his adding that since they had given up drinking they were thus comfortably circumstanced, we conclude that there has been of late a movement in favour of temperance. Thus ploughing the deep and reaping its harvests with their own tools, these hardy men are the sole proprietors of the profits of their toil. And hard and perilous toil it is: perilous to the men, and hard and laborious to the women. The pilchard fishing generally requires the men to be out at night; when the husband returns from his night's work the spoil is handed over to the women, on whom devolves the labour of cleaning and salting the fish, and often of carrying their baskets round the country to supply the scattered villages and farm houses. But notwithstanding this toilsome life there was an air of comfort and respectability generally prevalent.

On our arrival on the coast the sea wore all its softest aspect, before we left it displayed itself in all the sublimity of the storms which beat on these Southern walls of our island, and

Digitized by Google

we could realize something of the dangers of a sea-faring life. When we did leave it was with the consciousness of having laid up many pleasant memories of our kindly neighbours, and with our sketch-book filled with mementos of the many lovely spots where pleasant hours had been passed.

We returned home believing that our journey had not been without some useful lessons. We returned with undiminished attachment to our own Church, and with increased appreciation of the privileges we habitually enjoy in having its services and ministrations in all their simplicity and integrity,—grateful for being thus blessed when so many congregations are distressed by doctrines and practices contrary to the plain teachings of the Church of England. We returned with the strongest conviction of the utter mistake those make who think that the people of England will ever be won over by the means of Romanized ceremonies; and more than ever grateful that in our own parish we still enjoy the services of our own Church in all their purity: fully persuaded moreover that if we are ever drawn into the arms of dissent it will not be in the direction of Ritualism.

A LAYMAN.

CLERICAL POLICY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Clerical Policy of the Nineteenth Century. By Heinrich Von. Sybel. Translated, with the Author's sanction, by J. Scot Henderson. With Preface by Translator. Hatchards. 1875.

THE author of these brief and comprehensive lectures is a Professor of the University of Bonn,—largely a Roman Catholic foundation,—and is, we believe, a Roman Catholic himself. In a short preface to the pamphlet, dated April, 1874, he states the object which he has in view:—

"During the last few years," are his words, "we have received a number of instructive and remarkable expositions of the modern Church policy. These have been furnished for Germany by the original researches of Mejer, Schulte, Friedberg, Rippold, and Sicherer. Most of them, however, seem up to the present to be only known to the circle of professional scholars. I have gladly acceded to the desire of many hearers to print a bird's-eye view of these events in the following lectures."

The lectures commence with a striking contrast between the statements made by the contending parties in the conflict between State and Church, which occupies half Europe and agitates Germany from one end to the other. The State, and along with it the Liberal parties, assert that they never dream of

Digitized by Google

any interference with individual conscience, forms of Divine worship, and the care of souls:—

"That they maintain is the binding force of the National Legislation over the outward relations in law of all individuals and corporations, and therefore of the ecclesiastical and religious societies in the country. They are ready to grant to these all due privileges of freedom, the same as to town and county associations, universities and trading combinations, only upholding that the limits of these rights, in all cases, must be decided by the National Legislation."

The Clerical party, on the other hand, repudiate this view. They maintain that "the claim of the State to make laws regarding legal relations in Church matters, conceals an unjust and deadly peril to the Catholic religion." "They desire," they allege, "freedom for themselves, freedom for the Church, freedom for all." They affirm the omnipotence of the State to be "a modern Pagan idea." In a line with the most extreme Radicals and Democrats, they demand no limitation of individual liberty by the State. They agitate for "universal suffrage; removal of restrictions on the press; the right of association; universal freedom of opinion; and abolition of compulsory education." If reminded that, in the middle ages, the Popes suppressed intellectual freedom by fire and sword, and demanded the submission of Kings and people, they retort that "it is a vulgar lie for anyone to allege that the Church seeks such an end, and utterly false to attribute to them any other object than to secure liberty of conscience and the cultivation of piety."

Such is the profession of the Clerical party, which the Professor proceeds to test by an appeal to facts, not hidden in the dust of ages, but such as have occurred within the last fifty or sixty years.

Before entering on an historical investigation of the consistency of the Clerical party as to their aims and objects, the Professor draws a distinction between the terms Catholic and Clerical. "The Catholic," he says, "is one who accepts the doctrines proclaimed by the Catholic Church regarding God and divine things." The Clerical, on the other hand, is one "who desires, for clerical officials, rights of authority in temporal matters, over the State, the schools, and science."

From the sixth to the thirteenth century, the growth of the universal ascendency of the Papacy is traced in a few graphic paragraphs. There arose opposition on every side, culminating in the Reformation. The spell in which Europe was bound was broken, and the Roman Church lost millions of followers, and its supremacy over States was weakened in some cases, utterly broken in others.

Digitized by Google

At the end of the eighteenth century it seemed to be over with the mediæval greatness of the Papacy; but "the hour of deepest humiliation became the turning point." The French Revolution broke out. Persecution was the beginning of fresh advancement. The Bishops turned to the head of the whole Church in their hour of distress, and saw in the unity of the Church security against total destruction. The personal character of Pius VII., and the skilful diplomacy of his Minister, Cardinal Gonsalvi, served to strengthen the interests of the Papacy. Pliant in small matters, he was unbending in things of importance. Great privileges were secured to the Church in the Concordat of 1802 with Napoleon; but when Napoleon demanded the open recognition of freedom of worship in France, Gonsalvi was immovable. "The Catholic Church," he said, "could not force the Emperor to proceed against heretics: it never would acknowledge that heresy was justified." Thus the policy was to bear in silence, or under protest, what could not be altered; but when the power seemed present, the old principles of intolerance were put forward unmodified. The Kurfürst of Bavaria was threatened with ban and deposition if he did not persecute the Lutheran clergy, acknowledge the Canon Law, and restrict the freedom of the press. At Rome the Inquisition was established; the office of the Index restored; 2,400 monastic and conventual establishments in the states of the Church were restored and endowed, and education placed entirely under control of the clergy, under whose enlightened care ninety per cent. of the people were allowed to grow up without knowing how to read or write!

It is exceedingly difficult to give a condensed account of that which is itself confessedly a condensation. It will be sufficient that we generally describe the course of this able pamphlet, as our object is to induce our readers to procure it and read it themselves.

"*Semper eadem*" is the proud boast of Rome, and in one sense the claim is true. It is true as to the claim of universal supremacy over the whole region of thought and morals; it is untrue in reference to her doctrines. They are ever developing, ever departing from the standard of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the early Church. If the Papal Court, or Curia, cannot always carry out their principles into practice, they abide their time. They obtain, if possible, a general acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Canon Law, but await the time for carrying it into execution.

Count Rechberg, minister of Bavaria in 1815, resolved to meet the Curia with their own weapon; and in obtaining a Concordat from the Pope, he in terms admitted the validity of the Canon

Digitized by Google

Law, but he secured that this should only be proclaimed in Bavaria as the law of the State; so that while in appearance the Canon Law was admitted, in effect it could only be carried out to the extent to which the State Law provided in conformity with the principles of the Constitution.

Thus the Curia were paid in their own coin, and Rome for once was outwitted. The Constitution proclaimed equal toleration of Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches; and up to the present, in Bavaria, no clergyman can become parish priest or Bishop without the Royal sanction. The effect of this virtual supremacy of the State is to modify the Roman Catholicism of the clerical party in Bavaria and to make the Church more popular and national.

Now, in contrast with this, the policy in Protestant Prussia has been to pamper and pet the Roman Catholic Church. This is shown at length by Von Sybel: who says, "What is now denounced in Prussia by the Clerical party as grievous persecution and violation of the Divine law, has for fifty years been the acknowledged law in Bavaria; always, as will be understood, with a silent reservation on the side of the Roman Curia whenever circumstances appear favourable to revert to the application of the Concordat in a canonical sense."

The second lecture is taken up in describing the clerical intrigues in France in the years 1815—30; ending in the revolution, which as "a sudden thunder-clap shattered the plot which encircled the world." The third lecture traces the working of the Roman clerical policy in Germany at large, in which the large concessions of Prussia to the Roman Church are set forth. On Lord Houghton's asking Cardinal Antonelli how the English Government could satisfy the Catholic clergy of Ireland, he received from the Pope's Secretary of State the curt reply: "I can tell you in a word. Introduce the Prussian Church Laws."

The professor then says, "These have existed for a generation, and it is worth while to inquire into their effects. Have men grown happier, wiser, and more virtuous under this system? The reply must be given in full, it is too instructive to abridge a line of it.

"If we look to the condition of the Church itself, we cannot, of course, refuse to recognise the universal obedience and submission to every direction of the spiritual superiors. But this result is dearly bought: it is secured by the sacrifice of every form of law and guarantee for justice, on the part of subordinates, to the authorities in question, as has been quite recently illustrated by the proceedings of the Bishops against Old Catholic holders of benefices,—proceedings utterly irregular and absolutely inconsistent with Ecclesiastical law. Quite as obvious is the decay of scientific training in theological

Digitized by Google

literature; and the present party conflicts are conducted in many cases with utter recklessness in the choice of means. The property interests of the parishes have benefited little by the boasted independence of the Church; the checking of accounts, mostly intrusted to the junior clergy, is frequently put off for years; the investment of capital, no longer controlled by persons who understand the subject, has in many instances resulted in heavy loss. It is certainly a mode of management very different from the ordinary, when the fire insurance of the churches of a diocese is disposed of according to the amount of the commission which the societies concerned pay to the Bishop.

"In regard to the moral and spiritual condition of the population that has grown up since 1850, it is notorious that the criminal statistics of the period have not become more favourable. It would excite astonishment were any one to affirm that the great mass of the people—the working classes—have grown more industrious, more frugal, or more regardful of their duties. Nobody will attribute these evils as due to the clerical system; but it is surely something that the removal of State control has brought to the Church absolutely no increase of energy in combating them; that in such a task it accomplishes no more than the Protestant clergy who obey the law of the State. The effects of the system can be accurately estimated in the sphere of clerical education; we, without doubt, in the last thirty years have witnessed a decided retrogression, to which other causes, of course, may have contributed, but the clerical influences in which are altogether unmistakable. With this are connected the frequent complaints of the State officials, that the clerical superintendence of schools favour the efforts of such parents as seek to withdraw their children from the school before the expiry of the school period. For a long time the Clerical party has agitated against universal school attendance: it sees the violation of a sacred right of freedom, because the State does not permit fathers to let their children grow up in ignorance.

"How little the people are taught by the priests to value the blessings of a higher education is evident from the fact before-mentioned, which still holds true, that at our Gymnasia and upper schools the number of Catholic pupils is barely half as great as the Protestant, in proportion to the relative numbers of the population.

"These figures alone suffice to explain why, in filling the higher offices of the State, there is a corresponding superiority in the number of Protestants; and why, in nearly all the Rhenish towns, the Protestants are wealthier than the Catholics; for education alone is the ladder of promotion and the source of wealth.

"The results of education in the Catholic Gymnasia in the Rhine provinces are also, with a few honourable exceptions, sadly behind.

"I am able to assert with official certainty, after twelve years experience, that of the students who came to us from that quarter, a fourth part cannot write German grammatically, and perhaps three-fourths are incapable of reading easily a simple Greek or Latin author. Is it saying too much if we express the opinion, that

Digitized by Google

if we are not yet in the condition of Spain, the clerical system has done all it could to bring us to it?"

Another triumph of the Roman Curia is recorded in the Concordat with Austria, in 1855. Into the details of this we do not enter; but mention is made of it to show the advance toward a policy of intolerance which is to be traced along the whole line of Roman contact with European politics. The Professor makes it clear, that so far as the enjoyment of perfect freedom of religion and worship,—nay, even while receiving a proportion of State patronage and endowment beyond that enjoyed by Protestant Churches,—nothing was wanting which reason could require. Viewed as a system for promoting spiritual doctrines the position of the Church was complete, her privileges great, her action unimpeded: where then did the shoe pinch? German unity, national strength, and institutions developing toward greater freedom, all were obstacles and hindrances to the unchangeable ambition for complete supremacy, which—and not the promulgation of Divine truth—is the end, aim, and object of the Romish system. Under the garb of religion and under cover of the authority of teachers of saving truth, the clerical policy at Rome is to become the supreme governors of mankind.

Thus the present policy of the State in Germany is adopted in self-defence: it is a duty of self-preservation. The professor's description of the position is given in the following words:—

"At a time when the Prussian Government limited the autonomy of the Bishops at no point; when with a population of which two-thirds were Protestants, a contribution was given to the costs of Catholic worship a third more than to the Protestant; and when it did everything to place a third of its citizens in a position of dependence on the clergy that was fatal to the intellect. Under such circumstances the Clerical party of all Europe began the attack upon us, assuredly not because Prussia menaced religion, but because it sought the unity of Germany."

The following are the conclusions to which Von Sybel brings his lectures.

(1) When the Clerical party talks of liberty and security of the Church, it always has in view a state of authority in which on the one hand there is no kind of limitation of the Church's powers of punishment, its influence over the education of the rising generation, and its liberty of amassing property and wealth; while on the other it claims power to extirpate or persecute all opponents.

(2) Another point, not less expressively manifest, is the utter uselessness of diplomatic transactions and contracts with the Church of Rome. Every admission unfavourable to the clerical

Digitized by Google

interest is regarded as subject to recall at any moment, according to the convenience of the Curia. On the other hand, every rule of State legislation which happens to correspond with clerical wishes, is viewed as a right that has been for ever secured and cannot be touched by the State.

(3) That the solution of the problem impending between the Roman Church and the State is not to be sought by dissolving the connection between Church and State. Such a solution for the Clerical party is an empty sound.—

"We have to do," says the Professor, "with a corporation organized after a military fashion, and which counts in Germany more than thirty thousand agents, sworn to strict obedience, and in manifold forms which possesses wealth to the amount of many millions. It is true the State can do nothing against it without the aid of scientific exposition; but, on the other hand, without the effective energy of the State, theoretical criticism would die away on the wind, without leaving a trace behind it."

We add one more conclusion, which is indeed a development of the Professor's opinion last stated. It is, that a State, in alliance with a scriptural Church, and acknowledging the truth of God up to the extent of its powers, can alone present an impregnable bulwark to the pretentions of the Papacy. Many good Christians are prone to regard the Revelation which God has given solely as to its end in offering salvation in another world. This no doubt is its chief end; but is there not an end to be sought in the softening and sweetening life in this world, —in the erection of human polities on the basis of revealed truth,—in founding human society on the principles of the Word of God? Is there not such a thing as a Christian state and citizenship in a Christian country? Our conviction is that this cannot be attained except by the union of a Church, free in the possession of Divine truth, and free to promulgate it, in a state which, while tolerant of all freedom of thought, fosters only those forms of faith and worship which are consistent with the sole authority of God's Word.

Professor Sybel's pamphlet does not enter at all into the discussion of the truth or falsehood of Roman Catholic doctrine, and he is therefore the more impartial witness as to the unrelenting policy of Rome to make clerical power the great end of her efforts; and thus is demonstrated the truth of the position, that under all her claims and professions of freedom, she is the enemy of all religious and civil liberty.

We trust that this telling exposition of the "Clerical Policy of the Nineteenth century" will be widely circulated and read.

Digitized by Google

THE PILGRIM PSALMS.

The Pilgrim Psalms. An Exposition of the Songs of Degrees. By the Rev. Samuel Cox, Author of "An Expositor's Note-book," "A Day with Christ," etc., etc., London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co. 1874.

The Book of Psalms, of "David the King and Prophet." Disposed according to the Rhythmical Structure of the Original. With Three Essays, Map, and Illustrations. By E. F. London: Longmans. 1875.

It is well known to Biblical students that there are three prevailing theories as to the origination of the title "Songs of Degrees," which we find prefixed to Psalms cxx.,—cxxxiv. Some think that they are so designated as being the songs with which the Jewish exiles refreshed themselves on their return from Babylon. Others think that they derive their name from the ascending scale on which they are said to be composed: the words employed in the earlier verses of the Psalms being repeated and, if we may so say, intensified, in the later verses. Others again, and, as Mr. Cox thinks, with more reason, consider that these Psalms derive their designation from the fact that they were sung by the Hebrew pilgrims who annually went up to Jerusalem to "keep holiday before the Lord" in His temple. The Jews, as is well known, were a musical people; and those who know how natural it is for such,—especially in Eastern countries,—to beguile the tedium of their journey by song, will readily believe that the periodical pilgrimages to Jerusalem at the time of the celebration of the three great national festivals formed no exception to the prevailing custom of the country.

Nor is this belief without some Scriptural foundation, inasmuch as the prophet Isaiah, in a passage to which Mr. Cox has referred, not only makes mention of "a song, as in the night when a holy solemnity is kept," but continues, in words which may well bear the interpretation affixed to them by Mr. Cox, "as when one goeth forth with a pipe (or flute) to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the mighty One of Israel."[a] Without attempting to fix precisely the chronological sequence of this series of Psalms, Mr. Cox proceeds to expound both their primary import and also their permanent and universal lessons, in the order in which they now stand in the Psalter,—an order which, as regards the first and last at least of the series, appears to correspond very accurately with the circumstances attendant upon the departure of the pilgrims from home and their final service in Jerusalem.

[a] Isaiah xxx. 29.

Digitized by Google

Without any attempt to assign the palm to the exposition of any one in particular of these "Songs of Degrees," we will refer, by way of illustration, to the manner in which Mr. Cox has handled Psalm cxxxii., to which he has assigned the designation, "The Song of the Ark."

Adopting here, as in the case of the other Psalms of Degrees, a revised translation, which reflects credit on the critical scholarship of the writer, and also a metrical arrangement, Mr. Cox divides this "Song of the Ark" into three strophes, consisting respectively of verses 1—5, 6—10, and 11—18.

In few and well-chosen words our author describes the imposing scene which must have presented itself to the view of the assembled multitudes when the sacred ark was borne in triumph from the simple tent which David had pitched for it upon Mount Sion, to the magnificent sanctuary which Solomon had erected for it on Mount Moriah.

We shall not follow Mr. Cox in his inquiry into the authorship of this Psalm, which, in common with some able critics (as Tholuck and De Wette), he assigns to Solomon, but which we are disposed to regard rather as one of a composite character.

Whilst unable, however, in the course of this brief notice to follow Mr. Cox in his ingenious arguments in support of the supposition that this psalm was composed by Solomon, on the great and memorable occasion already mentioned, we may observe that it appears to us more probable that the germ of the psalm may be ascribed to the pen of David; that it was adapted to the occasion of the transfer of the ark to the temple of Solomon; and that it may have been employed in the temple service at later periods on occasions of special solemnity.[b] This supposition offers, in our judgment, the most natural solution of the opening words of the psalm,

> "Lord, remember to David
> All the trouble endured by him."

If, however, the Davidic origin of the Psalm be rejected, and we freely admit that, even as regards its germ, that origin must be regarded as doubtful, we should still demur to Mr. Cox's interpretation of the opening prayer, "Lord, remember David; requite to him, in the dim Hadean world, the pains he took. Remember how he resolved, how he swore, to build a house for Thee," etc., etc. (page 270); and we should deem the interpreta-

[b] It is somewhat remarkable that whilst Mr. Cox alludes in a foot-note on page 292 to the connection between Psalms cxxxii. and cxxxiii., he takes no notice of the fact that the title of the latter Psalm, as it is found in the Authorised English Version, in accordance with the majority of Hebrew MSS., is "A Song of Degrees of David;" a title which, whatever explanation may be given to the Hebrew particle which is here rendered "of," seems to connect this Song of Degrees *in some manner* with the royal psalmist.

Digitized by Google

tion much more consistent with the analogy of Scripture which refers the word "David" to David's son, or to David's house, just as in Psalm cxlvii. 19 "Jacob" is used to denote his descendants.

In the exposition of verse six of this Psalm, Mr. Cox transliterates the Hebrew word "Ja'ar," which the Authorized Version renders "wood," and explains it as denoting "Kirjath-Jearim;" whilst he declines to decide whether the word "Ephratah" is to be regarded as the ancient name of Bethlehem, or the district of Caleb-Ephrathah,—*i.e.*, "the district above Kirjath-Jearim;" or as denoting generally "the fruitful country of Beth-Shemesh," where the ark was first deposited by the Philistines.

Mr. Cox concludes his exposition of this "Song of the Ark" with the following passage, which we select as presenting a fair specimen not only of the style but also of the devotional spirit of the writer:—

"And have *we* no part in the song? Has it no charm for us? It has a most potent charm: and that not simply because it reminds us how God meets and out-does our requests, and is ever more ready to give than we are to ask, but also because it speaks to us of Him who was at once David's Son and Lord, the true 'power' and 'lamp;' that is the Light and Strength of the world. The seed of David no longer occupies a throne if Christ be not the promised 'seed.' There is no longer a temple, a place in which God and man may meet and rest and dwell together, if Christ be not at once Temple and Ark, Oracle and Sacrifice. The 'Anointed One' who reigns for ever, and whose crown still 'blossoms' into new vigour and beauty is—must be—He whom we call the Christ, or Anointed One of God; and therefore, grand as the Psalm was when it was first sung by the Levitical choirs, full as it was of glorious and pathetic memories to the later pilgrims who went up to Zion, it has reserved its fulness of meaning and the excellence of its glory for us, if only we have found the Son of God in that Son of Man who was 'of the house and lineage of David.'" (Pp. 283—5.)

In conclusion we will venture to submit to Mr. Cox's consideration, should these pages meet his eye, whether in the frequent editions which this book is likely to reach, it might not be desirable to avoid some slight peculiarities of phraseology which seem to us calculated needlessly to perplex one class of those readers for whom the work is designed. We will illustrate the drift of our remark in the two following instances:—

I. The use of the word "trend" in page 146, in the sense of *incline*.

II. The use of "pled" in page 281, as the past-participle of "plead."

We wish, however, to be understood as pronouncing no other opinion on these slight peculiarities, than that in the case of a work like this, we should desire to see no room left for captious objection.

Digitized by Google

We now turn to the second of the works which stand at the head of this article, the chief design of which is to arrange the Psalms of David "according to the structure of the poetry of the Hebrew original."

We hail so gladly any work, conceived and executed in a devout spirit, which is calculated to elucidate in any degree the design and the literal and spiritual import of the Psalter, that we are anxious to extend the full meed of praise even to those works in which this object appears to us to be very inadequately attained. In regard to the volume now under review, our commendation must be of a somewhat qualified character.

The Book of Psalms has been so often "disposed according to the rhythmical structure of the original," in accordance with the views of the respective writers, that we doubt the expediency of adding one more volume to the many which already exist, unless the writer is able to throw some fresh light upon the subject which he treats. In the present instance we are constrained to express our doubt whether much has been accomplished in this respect. The stichometrical arrangement of the Psalms corresponds, as far as we have observed, to a very considerable extent with that adopted by other editors and critics, and in some of those instances in which it differs from them we doubt whether the deviations are improvements. We more than doubt the expediency of adopting the Prayer-book version of the Psalter as the basis of any work which is designed to elucidate, even for the benefit of ordinary English readers, its true meaning; and in one at least of the cases in which the writer has deviated from that version, as well as from the Authorized English Version of 1611, A.D.,—viz., in Psalm lxxxiv. 3,—he has substituted a paraphrastic rendering which, in our judgment, is further removed from the original than either of those which he has rejected. In the three essays which we find appended to the body of this work, the writer displays, as it appears to us, a larger amount of reading than of discrimination. In the first of these essays, entitled "The Psalms of David restored to David," the writer attempts to disprove the later origin of many of those psalms which the majority of orthodox modern critics assign to periods varying from the time of Solomon to that which followed closely upon the Babylonish exile, and which the critics of the negative school assign to a still more recent date, and more particularly to the time of the Maccabees.

Whilst agreeing with some of the writer's conclusions, we are altogether unable to accept many of his theories. We may refer, by way of illustration, to his account of the Psalm contained in 1 Chron. xvi., a Psalm which, whether it was composed

Digitized by Google

at a later period out of earlier Psalms, or whether those Psalms were subsequently composed in part or in whole out of it, combines almost all the whole of Psalm xcvi. and portions of Psalms cv. and cvi. Now the theory that this Psalm was composed by David on the occasion of bringing up the Ark to Mount Sion, as maintained by the writer in common with Keil and others, whether defensible or not, is sufficiently intelligible and consistent to demand serious consideration. On the other hand, the further theory espoused by our author, that this Psalm was first composed by David as a whole on the occasion specified, and that it was afterwards employed by him in the composition of Psalms xcvi., cv., and cvi., or, to adopt the words of the writer, "elaborated" into those Psalms, must, we think, appear to the majority of Biblical critics as one altogether improbable and unsupported by any sufficient proof. The assertion of the writer that these Psalms are attributed to David "by the Word of God" (p. 237) is one for which we are at a loss to discover even the shadow of any foundation. We are, of course, aware that it has been inferred by competent critics, from 1 Chron. xvi. 7, that David was the writer of the whole of the Psalm recorded in that chapter; and although, as Hebrew critics well know, the language there employed may bear another significance, the inference, as we have already intimated, is one which may very reasonably, though not necessarily, be drawn from it. We are altogether at a loss, however, to see how, even if this inference be admitted, it can be alleged that the three Psalms which we have named are attributed to David "by the Word of God;" and we feel constrained to bear our testimony against the adoption of language in regard to which the writer's inexperience in critical investigations can, in our judgment, alone be urged by way of extenuation. We have observed other passages to which objection may fairly be taken, but we refrain from adducing them.

The second essay is devoted to the consideration of the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry, whilst in the third essay the writer examines the views of several modern writers on the position of Mount Zion, of the lower city, and of Mount Moriah, as the result of which examination our author arrives at the conclusion that the assertion of Josephus respecting the division of the city into four quarters, consisting respectively of the Upper and Lower City, the Temple Mount, and Bezetha, or the New City, is substantially correct.

The volume is illustrated by some interesting sketches made by the author, and with a well-executed map of the city of Jerusalem.

Digitized by Google

FOUR YEARS' EXPERIENCE OF DISESTABLISHMENT.

PART III.

The Social Results of Disestablishment.

In the present article our readers shall be spared the statistics which were necessary in the previous one. Our table is indeed covered with a fresh shower of pamphlets since we wrote last; but as they bear on finance rather than social statistics we shall trouble them but little.

It was not to be expected that so grave an event as Disestablishment and Disendowment could have occurred to the Church of Ireland without producing social change. Disestablishment robbed her clergy of much of worldly prestige; Disendowment robbed them of much of worldly wealth. And the result naturally has been to diminish the attractions of the clerical profession as such in the eyes of those who joined it either because it was respectable, or because it was well paid. Time was when the sons of noblemen and large landed proprietors worked their way as Fellow-Commoners through Trinity College, and when "Hon. and Rev." was not a very rare designation of a country parson. It is hard to believe that there will be many more velvet gowns and tasselled caps among the undergraduate divinity students in Dublin University, for the ranks of the clergy of the present are being recruited to a notable extent from a very different stratum of society. Among those well-born clergy of the past were many names honourable in the highest sense in which a clergyman can be honoured. Some of the most devoted labourers in the Church of Ireland during the past half century, since the Evangelical revival of 1825 and following year, were sons and brothers of the nobles of the land.

The cutting off of this class of candidates from the ministry of the Church is to be lamented. Fully as we recognise the force of the argument drawn from the low origin of the first Apostles,—or some of them,—we do not see that it overthrows the fact that a "gentleman" alone is usually acceptable as a preacher and pastor to gentlemen. Even those most anxious to purge from their minds the prejudice against a clergyman which lack of refinement in speech, manner and bearing, is sure to raise, must inevitably feel that they derive most profit from the public ministrations of the man whom they also can enjoy and value in private as a friend and equal. To the middle and lower orders of society a man of their own position may be most acceptable: though this, too, is a matter which is open to question. To the gentry, who are nearly all members of the Church of Ireland, the ministrations of anyone but a gentleman

Digitized by Google

are, to say the least, occasionally uncomfortable. The only thing which can even in part atone for the absence of this qualification for the pastorate among the upper classes, is the combination of mental cultivation with deep spirituality of mind. And we have met with men,—a minority it is true, but a respectable minority,—who, having no social recommendation to prepare the way, have proved acceptable to the educated gentry, both in the pulpit and in the drawing-room. We have, however, witnessed the anomaly of a curate in sole charge of a somewhat aristocratic parish, who being but lately promoted from the position of a Scripture-reader to poor Romanists, possessed qualifications which, while sure to gain him a hearing from the cattle-drivers at Ballinasloe fair, were little likely to recommend the Gospel to the young ladies in the Squire's pew.

It is difficult to write on this subject without giving offence; but it is only fair that English readers should know the truth,—that an ever-increasing number of candidates for the ministry of the Irish Church is drawn from below the middle stratum of society in that country. The like result would, so far as can be predicted, follow the like cause in England. The education of a literate is not a very costly one, and even if it were, the Irish shopkeeper in a provincial town is now making plenty of money, and can afford to pay for his son's training for that which to him still seems an aristocratic profession. It is impossible to furnish statistics on so delicate a matter as we have in hand; but it may be accepted as unquestionably true, that whatever the total number of candidates for the ministry of the Church in Ireland may be,[a] the proportionate number of them, who are gentlemen by birth, has declined during the past ten, and still more, during the past five years, to an alarming degree. Some of the new class of clergy are men of fair education: many, we charitably hope, are men of decided piety; but no requirements of charity shall force us to say we hail the change with pleasure. "The old is better."

Did our Diocesan Councils and our Boards of Nomination, described in the first of this series of papers, resolve to adjust so far as possible the social position of parishes and pastors, the inconvenience of the new state of things might be reduced for some years to a minimum. But if they ignore this not unimportant qualification in making and confirming appointments,—

[a] During the two years immediately following Disestablishment, the number of divinity students who passed the final divinity examination decreased from fifty-seven to twenty-seven. Some recovery in the way of numbers has since taken place, and the divinity school is now animated with a considerable amount of zeal and earnestness. The numbers attending a weekly prayer-meeting in Trinity College are largely increased.

Digitized by Google

and if they tolerate the placing of an ordained parish clerk, school-master, or Scripture-reader over a parish in which several landed gentry and their families form the bulk of the congregation,—they must not complain if in a few years they find that the Church has lost its hold on this class. Mr. Moody may be welcomed as a passing Evangelist: he would fail as a pastor to this class. The populous towns with their thousands of the working-classes, the remote villages and agricultural districts, of which there are many, are the most suitable position in which men of piety and zeal, but without birth or much cultivation, may exercise their ministry. There we may hope and believe that the blessing of God will not be brought into too open conflict with the prejudices of society.

Turning from this branch of the subject, the interesting question of the altered relations between the clergy and laity in matters of church government presents itself for notice. We have already seen that a marvellous tide of lay interest and effort began to flow on the very day when the "upas tree" stretched its branches on the ground. The full and almost unanimous welcome given to the laity in her Synods and Councils augured well from the first, and we are persuaded that, on the whole, the presence and power of the laity in such assemblies is a matter of vital importance to the Church. Leaving out the question (as one open to fair difference of opinion) whether laymen should have an equal share in the moulding of creeds and confessions of faith, in the decision of sacramental and theological controversies, needing accurate and prolonged study of a peculiar kind, it seems to be beyond dispute that the laity and clergy, and not the clergy alone, being the Church, the former should be admitted as freely and fully as possible to all Church Councils. None indeed but a bigot will hold, we presume, that earnestness and piety alone will make a man a theologian, and render him competent to debate on equal terms with professors of divinity and the Bishops of the Church. But it is equally bigotry on the other side to maintain that that earnestness and piety is to count for nothing in the scale, and that all theology is bad which has not been moulded by Bishops and presbyters with closed doors, and then presented to the laity for unconditional acceptance, as a sort of semi-infallible decree.

In the decision of the relative parts which clergy and laity should play in discussions on doctrine there is great need for the possession and exercise of common sense. It is not ordination which makes a man a theologian. He is a theologian if he loves God and understands theology. If he does not, whether clergyman or layman, he had better, if he be wise, keep his hand off theological questions, lest, in endeavouring honestly to prevent

Digitized by Google

schisms, he tumble with bewilderment into unsuspected heresies.

We mean no irreverence when we warn the uninitiated against trying their "prentice hand" on a subject which even a primate of the Romish Church, with all the powers of the Vatican, and all the libraries of the Church at his back, may not always handle without suspicion of heresy, even on so fundamental a question as the deity of our Lord. [b]

Since we are treating, not of the theological, but of the social results of Disestablishment in the sister Church, we must exercise strict self-denial, and not suffer ourselves to be tempted into the labyrinth of the Revision question, which would require, at least, a considerable article to itself. The social relations of the clergy and laity are altered by Disestablisment, outside as well as within the walls of the Diocesan Synod halls. These altered relations may be summed up under the heads of *division of labour*, and *adjustment of power*.

I. On the former of these subjects no words can be used sufficiently to acknowledge what assistance the laity of the Irish Church have given to their clergy, and their Church at large. We have before us the reports of eleven Diocesan Councils for 1874. They contain the names of 217 laymen elected to manage the financial affairs of these dioceses, and from the register of attendance at the Council meetings it would appear that in a large majority of cases the offices thus delegated to them were not regarded as sinecures. In these Diocesan Councils the reins are held by which the more or less willing teams of parochial subscribers are driven and guided. All matters relating to parochial and episcopal sustentation, division or amalgamation of parishes, care and insurance of churches, repairs or erection of glebe houses, and in some cases of school buildings, are transacted. In these matters the laymen elected by each diocese take a willing and prominent part. There are clergy who have a taste for finance, but generally speaking the balance sheets and calculations of qualified laymen are more highly valued. It may be said that the spirit of the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles has been embodied in the Diocesan Councils of the sister Church, and we can only say if the whole body of the clergy give themselves as devotedly to the "ministry of the word and prayer" as this new sub-diaconate, if we may so term it, has given itself to the serving of tables, a most successful example of division of labour on Christian principles will be set to other Churches.

---

[b] See correspondence between Dr. Nicholson and Archbishop Manning, in *Guardian*, 1873.

Digitized by Google

In parochial affairs the same wholesome division of labour is now to be seen in a majority of cases in the Disestablished Church. Five years ago the clergyman was an irresponsible agglomeration of heterogeneous offices, if the figure be permitted. He was preacher, catechist, visitor, almoner, secretary, treasurer, law adviser, arbitrator, and very often practically churchwarden as well. Once a year he went through the form of an Easter Vestry, in which he submitted or not certain accounts of moneys, all of which in average parishes were raised, disbursed, and booked by himself. He was asked no questions about his integrity, and received no thanks for his trouble. A silent acquiescence in the order of things brooded over nineteen parishes out of twenty, and nobody seemed to think there was anything to be corrected in this state of things. Standing high in the confidence of the laity, nearly all the clergy performed the multitudinous offices of which a sample has been given, with correctness and occasionally with skill. But the burden was heavy, and no one seemed to perceive that it sat on the wrong shoulders.

The Church Act changed all that. The General Convention, by its statutes already epitomized, threw on every parish the duty of forthwith waking up and discharging its natural responsibilities, and we believe there are scarce a dozen parishes in Ireland which have not answered to the call. In well-organized parishes the staff of lay helpers is now somewhat as follows:—

(1) *The Registered Vestrymen*, consisting of all adult male Churchmen, who on making declaration of their qualification as residents, seat holders, or property holders in the parish, are registered in a book, annually revised in Vestry before Easter. None whose names do not appear on this roll are qualified to vote in the General Vestry.

(2) *The Select Vestry*, which consists of the rector, curate, churchwardens, and not more than twelve vestrymen, elected by the General Vestry at Easter out of their own body. The Select Vestry takes the management of parochial moneys, except Sacramental collections, and of parochial officers and buildings, church, glebe, and school.

(3) The Treasurer of the parish.

(4) The Secretary of the Select Vestry.

(5) The Collectors of Sustentation Fund.

(6) Three parochial nominators, besides the variable staff of district visitors, Sunday-school teachers, school masters and mistresses, organist, choir, loan and clothing and coal fund secretaries, and other officers to be found in well-regulated English parishes. Guilds and bell-ringing societies are all but unknown in the Irish Church.

Digitized by Google

It will be seen that the burden on the clergyman in financial matters and some others has thus been greatly reduced. The necessity put on parishes by law of organizing themselves in part has given the impetus in many places which has resulted in a still more complete organization and division of labour; and all this organization is generally working well. A move has lately been made in more than one Synod for the further organization of lay help, somewhat after the manner of the London Diocesan Lay Helpers' Association; and it is understood that at the meeting of the next General Synod, the Bishops will announce some plan on which they will authorize lay readers, under suitable circumstances, to assist the clergy as unordained and unpaid curates, in such functions as are not necessarily ministerial.

II. With regard to the *adjustment of power* as between the lay and clerical orders in Ireland, it cannot be said that the results in this direction are always as satisfactory as those which have followed the division of labour. Human nature, always near at hand both to clergyman and layman, has a natural fondness for power. It is far easier to part with half your labour than with half your power. The average man, distinguished by no remarkably devoted or self-denying characteristics, would always prefer letting another man do his work than interfere with his authority. But the other party in this rearrangement is human too, and he for his part may not be always prepared to accept a share in the toil unless he is also given a share of the government.

These simple principles, obvious to all our readers, have naturally been coming to the front in Irish Church matters. While the Church has been recrystallizing from its recent state of fusion, it is not wonderful that the polarity of human nature should introduce certain novel attractions and repulsions. In old times the Rector of the average country parish did all the work and governed everybody else. He was looked up to as the authority of the place; and not infrequently the Lord Chancellor endorsed the popular verdict by giving him the Commission of the Peace. This is all changed now. The law cast the Rector from the pedestal he had so long occupied, and except where he was also enshrined in the hearts of the people, the parishioners soon made him feel he was no longer supreme. Vestries began to be troublesome: pew-holders developed wills of their own: doctrines and practices were not silently accepted. The Church Convention had created select vestries and parochial nominators, and in some cases it was an offence not to put everybody in the parish into one or other of those positions of dignity. The vestries in certain cases (we do not mean to say they were numerous, but we have no statistics) thought that having legal

Digitized by Google

authority over sextons and organists, they had also authority over the Rector and his Curate; and imagined that the appointment of a Curate and the selection of a hymn-book came within the scope of their commission. It is enough to indicate this cause of trouble: our clerical readers can readily imagine for themselves the discomforts which might arise under unfavourable circumstances from this cause. We know of parishes where the assumption of unwarrantable authority on the part of the Select Vestry has led to disagreeable complications, and the stoppage of supplies. But we believe these are only a small minority.

There has been a tendency to another very objectionable kind of interference with constituted authority, in the assumption of power by some parishes to reverse elections made by their own parochial nominators. We have already explained the method of election of clergy in the Irish Church, and showed that the influence in an appointment is divided between the laity, who appoint three nominators from among themselves, and the diocese, which is represented by the Bishop, two clergyman and one layman, chosen by the Synod. Not satisfied with the result of an appointment in which their own deputies have had unquestionably the chief influence, some parishes have raised unseemly opposition afterwards to the clergymen so selected. The power of choosing nominators has been imagined to involve the power of reviewing and, if necessary, vetoing their action, and this has already been known to go so far as to issue in cries of "Down with Mr. ——," when the newly elected Vicar took his stand at the reading desk.

Except for such occasional *contretemps*, it may be acknowledged that the placing of elective power in the hands of Boards of Nomination has, with sundry general disadvantages, worked fairly. These disadvantages should, however, be considered more fully.

The Board of Nomination consists of two parts, one representing the parish and another the diocese. By common consent, but not in pursuance of any law, the preponderance of influence has been hitherto given to the parochial nominators. The result has been that the interest of the parish alone, or its supposed interest, has been considered. Every parish desires naturally to obtain the services of the best man; which, from the average point of view, means neither more nor less than the most popular preacher. Young Rectors of energy and gift of utterance have sprung up, since the passing of the Church Act, in ridiculous abundance, and grey headed curates still plod on unrewarded. The calm viewing of both questions as to parochial wants and clerical deserts from long service, has been relegated to the past.

Digitized by Google

The patronage of Bishops and private persons has passed away; and no middle aged unaccomplished man has a chance of election to a parish, if there be junior favourites in the field. "If," however, means much in this case; for it is rapidly coming to be the fact that the Boards of Nomination are thankful for the present to obtain the services of any decent candidate.

The transference of power to the Boards has had what many will, with the writer, consider to be the inexpedient and uncatholic effect of removing nearly all power from the Bishops of the Church. No Bishop can now, except in cases where lapse after six months' vacancy, or courtesy, gives him the power, make a single appointment in the Church. Even appointments to prebendal stalls in the national Cathedral of St. Patrick, Dublin, were vested in Diocesan Synods, which however have creditably to themselves generally offered this crumb of patronage to their Diocesan. The result is that young clergmen are tempted to court, if they court any human favour, the favour of the populace.

It appears to the writer very clearly, that it is superfluous caution and misplaced zeal for truth to make the appointment to bishoprics and to incumbencies alike the result of a popular vote. Assuming the common, but possibly fallacious, postulate that the laity are more likely to act for the glory of God than the Bishops, why not commit, as is now done, the election of the Bishop to the Synod, in which lay influence is to clerical in the proportion of two to one, and then in all or a fair proportion of cases give the Bishop, so chosen by the Synod (who of course have acted on the purest motives) the patronage of parishes in his diocese. By doing this, by *trusting* the Bishop, whom you have chosen out of all the clergy in the land, and permitting him to perform the most important object of fitting the man to the place and the place to the man, you will remove local scandals, contentions, or well meant mistakes, you will uphold the Episcopal influence in an Episcopal church, and you will give to the aged and possibly devoted, but less talented clergy, some provision, up to the noble maximum of £300 a year, for his old age. It is not to be expected that the Church will be freely supplied with clergy, if it come to be practically seen that Boards of Nomination will think of talent and zeal, but not of experience and merit, in making appointments.

The only remaining point on which we feel it desirable to follow up the social effects of Disestablishment concerns a controversy which for some months has stirred in the leading newspapers. The troubler of the pool was an Irish layman, who stated that the average Irish clergyman existed, as it would appear, for the purpose of first getting all the money he could lay his hands on, and then running away with it. This assertion

Digitized by Google

was supported by figures which appeared like statistics. The misrepresentation got twenty-four hours start of the emphatic denial which followed it, and more than twenty-four hours' start of the satisfactory explanation with which that denial was sustained. The Rev. Morgan Jellett, of Dublin, pointed out the fallacy of the ill-looking statistics, and clearly showed that the proportions of the commutation capital which a young clergyman could receive was not more than half that stated by the critic. The Ven. Archdeacon Lee wrote a letter of contradiction from a London club. Several Bishops and the Archbishops of the Irish Church briefly repudiated the charge; and after an interval of two months the Dean of Cork settled the question by an exhaustive pamphlet. Being a member of the General Synod and of the Representative Church Body, Chaplain to a Bishop and Dean of a Cathedral, possessing also a clear head for figures and a complete grasp of his subject, his tract [c] can be regarded in no other light than as a complete and authoritative refutation of the crude calumnies of "an Irish Layman."

Those of our readers who have felt any interest in perusing the information which we have given in these articles, will doubtless welcome some of the Dean's words on the subject:

"The charges," writes Dr. Gregg, "which I have seen brought against the Church are threefold. First, those relating to the number of appointments of curates, made between the passing of the Irish Church Act, in July, 1869, and the first of January, 1871, when the provisions of the Act came fully into force. Second, those relating to the policy of the Representative Body in conducting the financial affairs of the Church. Third, those relating to the conduct of the Irish clergy with regard to commuting and compounding." (p. 12.)

The statement concerning the number of new curates ordained in the interval between the passing and coming into full operation of the Church Act, was that about 700 men had been ordained in that interval, large numbers of whom were "boys" "under canonical age." Dr. Gregg shows by carefully digested figures that the total number of curates of all standings in Ireland, January 1st, 1871, was 764, of whom 201 were appointed after the passing of the Church Act. Of these thirty were paid by their Rectors, leaving 171 in place of 700, as the number of new appointments of curates with annuities.[d]

---

[c] "The Irish Clergy and the Representative Church Body. Remarks on the Financial Position of the Church of Ireland. By Robert S. Gregg, D.D., Dean of Cork. Dublin: Hodger, Foster and Co. 1874."

[d] In 1837 the number of curates in the Established Church in Ireland was 833, or sixty-nine more than in 1871.

Digitized by Google

From the number, 171, actually ordained in that interval, 1869-71, we must deduct 100, or the number of ordinations which according to the ordinary average would occur in the two years, which leaves about 70 additional ordinations as against the 700 paraded in the *Times*.

Then as to the assertion that men were ordained too young, it must be remembered, first, that many divinity students were actually in Trinity College under training for Holy Orders on the faith of the stability of the Establishment, and it was no scandal if these men were appointed somewhat sooner than they would have been in the ordinary course to curacies, seeing that their future prospects depended greatly on their gaining some recognition as annuitants before 1871; and, secondly, as to age, no youth was ordained without a *faculty*. A faculty to be ordained deacon under twenty-three is perfectly legal, and these deacons in every case remained till they were twenty-four before receiving priests' orders. Thus the scandal of an "ugly rush" into the ministry of vast numbers of unqualified youths is satisfactorily and completely rebutted.

On the second point, that concerning the financial policy of the Representative Church Body, we shall say nothing, because we have already treated somewhat at large on the question of finance, and could not take up the subject in our narrowing space.

The third and most detrimental accusation made against the clergy of the Irish Church was that numbers on obtaining annuities, "commuted, compounded, and cut,"—for this is the phrase which has been coined in the vein of Swift, and hung round the neck of the clergy of Ireland, with what justice we shall examine, with the assistance of the Dean's pamphlet. At p. 27 we read:—

"Some writers seem to regard it as a wrong thing for a clergyman to compound* at all. This is unfair. When the State stepped in and suddenly broke up the profession as such to which he had devoted his life, and put an end to all hopes of advancement, if he chose to say, I do not wish to work in the new condition of things; give me the proportion of the capital sum to which I am fairly entitled: his request should be granted without questioning his sincerity. And if a clergyman ordained in the United Church of England and Ireland chooses to work in England instead of Ireland, there is no reason why he should be exposed to the charges which have been so freely brought against him. It is said, too, that the Church

* Composition, in the Irish Church sense, means the division of capital in certain proportions, determined by age, between an annuitant clergyman and the Representative Body. On effecting composition he is free from duty, and the Church obtains a sum of money in lieu of his services, to apply to the good of the parish or diocese.

Digitized by Google

loses by the composition of so-and-so; but the Church gained very considerably by the commutation and composition taken together, and . . . a general commutation could not have been expected if the right of composition had not been given to the clergy."

The number of compositions of annuities which took place up to November 1st, 1874, was 735. The number of annuities still uncompounded was 1218, from which it appears that "commuting and compounding" was not the general rule. And these compositions left in the hands of the Church a sum of £1,085,422 3s. 8d. for carrying on the work of the Church.

Then as to the elegant word "cutting:" *i.e.*, the removal to England or elsewhere of compounding clergymen. The impression left upon the public mind by the "Irish Layman" in the *Times*, was that a large number,—perhaps a majority of the young clergy of Ireland,—had turned their backs on their Church, and like rats, quitted the sinking ship. What are the facts?

There are still 1218 annuitant clergymen who have not compounded, and are now working in the Church of Ireland. There are 450 more paid under the Diocesan Schemes, making 1668 clergy in active duty in Ireland. The number proposed to be maintained under the new arrangement is 1460,—so that the actual number of clergy in active work in the Church at the present moment, instead of being short of requirements, exceeds the staff proposed to be maintained by fully 200. "This one fact," says Dr. Gregg, "seems to me effectually to dispose of the charge of wholesale emigration which has been brought against the clergy."

What, however, has become of the compounders? Have they (as asserted) left the country? These are the facts, as collected from the Secretaries of the various dioceses by the Dean:—

71 have remained in their parishes without re-election.
51 have been re-elected to the same parishes.
283 have taken duty in *other parts of Ireland.*
136 have taken duty in England or elsewhere.
109 have retired (from age, infirmity, etc.)
45 have died.

So that, after all, of the 736 who compounded, 405 are still at work in their own church, and 136 have taken duty in England or elsewhere: not a large number, when we consider the large field open to clergymen in England; for many an earnest man would much rather enter on the largest field of labour, than spend his life in some lonely spot where but few would receive his ministrations.

In closing this series of articles on the sister Church, we shall

Digitized by Google

only add that, should they create any interest, much more remains to be told, which is calculated at once to warn English Churchmen against rashly falling in with the cry for liberty by Disestablishment, and at the same time to console those gloomy spirits who predict that the Church of the sister isle is "dying out." There are, we are bound to say, no signs of dissolution about her; but much revived spiritual earnestness, and many encouraging proofs of vigorous financial progress.

JAMES EVERETT: A BIOGRAPHY.

James Everett, a Biography. By Richard Chew. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1875.

VERY recently it fell to our lot to review the life of a local worthy, which by the injudicious admiration of his biographer had been expanded into a huge volume, a most singular farrago of facts and incidents concerning individuals, unknown to fame beyond a most limited circle. The good man in question had extensive sympathies with Methodism, but was not quite a Methodist. Now we have the life of a conspicuous Methodist, in another huge volume, disproportionate in size to its subject. The two works are not written by the same person, yet they almost might have been. In both there is the same tendency to invest trifling incidents in solemn language with copious diction: but yet there is a difference. We trust it will not be ascribed to any want of appreciation of the worthies whom the system of John Wesley has produced,—men distinguished not only for their oratorical power but also for their literary attainments,—if we venture some remonstrance against this curious hero-worship, which is a very serious thing for the reading public. We may best accomplish this by noting some specimens of the manner in which this book has attained its astonishing magnitude. After quoting, in an introductory chapter, Terence, Longfellow and Dr. Chalmers, on the subject of biography in general, Mr. Chew proceeds to tell us that seven cities contended for the birth of Homer. If there had been any doubt about the birthplace of Mr. Everett this might have been apposite; but there was none. Why then introduce the allusion? Some months after his birth Mr. Everett was baptized in the parish church: this, we are told, was in imitation of "the child Jesus being taken into the temple." It will be a matter of general interest to know that the certificate has been preserved; also that in the marriage lines of Mr. Everett, at a subsequent period, it was

Digitized by Google

specified that he was married by licence. Alnwick is, we are told, an ancient town, but the streets are paved and lighted with gas: as many people have not been in that neighbourhood, it may be satisfactory to know that these concomitants of civilization have penetrated so far. In the account of Mr. Everett's parentage there is an allusion to Edmundson's work on Heraldry, which contains the arms of Everett, but Mr. Chew has no means of ascertaining that those who bore them were the progenitors of James. The first twelve pages of the book might have been with propriety condensed into "James Everett was born at Alnwick on the 16th of May, 1784; in due course he was baptized in the parish church; his parents were humble but respectable people of the labouring class; his mother especially was a godly woman, a member of the Methodist society." We will not follow Mr. Chew into the account of Mr. Everett's youth. Until the period of his conversion he seems to have been much such another as John Bunyan: he learned to read and write, was a troublesome apprentice, fond of practical jokes, and met with hazardous adventures. In the chapter relating Everett's conversion, Mr. Chew curvets and canters with more than usual freedom. After quoting Richard Watson and Dr. Redford, he alludes to Coleridge and Goethe, and then says that his hero "received his first religious impressions in the Sabbath-school." When he was about twenty, after some trying experience and sore struggles, Mr. Everett became a converted man. The subsequent chapters recount his experience as a local preacher. When about twenty-seven he was admitted into full connection, as it is termed; which implies not only that he married, but was also appointed to a circuit. From this time Mr. Chew drops comparatively out of sight, and his place is taken by Mr. Everett himself. As a fair specimen of what the reader has to look for throughout the book we quote the following description:

"At Bramley I had the pleasure of entertaining Dr. Steadman, tutor of the Baptist Academy, at Bradford: his good lady accompanied him. He was a man of plain, unassuming, agreeable manners, and exceedingly communicative. His appearance was heavy, somewhat gross and fleshy; complexion dark; face inclined to be oval; was very near-sighted, and had an expression of benevolence and seriousness when seated in silence ..... He told me that he had assisted the Rev. Joseph Sutcliffe in securing for him diplomatic *(sic)* honours, and had been applied to for a commendation on behalf of the Rev. Joseph Edmundson, concluding in jocose mood, 'I have no doubt I could secure an M.A. for you.'"

Mr. Everett had the good sense to decline. The volume teems with similar descriptions. Here is one from the vestry of Annesley

Digitized by Google

chapel. After stating that the preacher had not on a wig, or as it is phrased "his fine forehead was unclouded by the hanging eaves of the thatch-like roof which afterwards disfigured it," it goes on to say, "he was seated on a bench, with his body inclined forward, one elbow on the same, and the face directed toward the floor, musing apparently on some subject; while the sole of one shoe was grinding the sand beneath it, to the sound of which he was yielding particular attention."

From first to last the book abounds with similar descriptions. A preacher "fat and loose in the flesh" is sure to be noted. As we kept wading through these descriptions, we could not help wondering whether these facts were ascertained by handling, as at the Agricultural Hall, or Zanzibar; and also thinking, what additional interest might have been commnnicated if the weight had been superadded. So far, however, as we can remember, this has been only attempted in one instance. The chairman at a meeting was fast asleep, the result of his bulk, a good dinner and lethargic habits: Mr. Everett ventures on a rough calculation that he "would weigh far on for thirty stone."

There is, however, another aspect in which this volume might be viewed. Mr. Everett, as his biographer admits, was "a man of war." The result of his belligerent propensities was that throughout the larger portion of his ministerial career he was in conflict with the authorities of Wesleyanism. Now it would be obviously unbecoming in us to follow him into these conflicts, and to rake up the ashes of a quarrel which terminated in a schism so serious that it might almost with propriety be termed a disruption of the Wesleyan body. The ruling spirit of the Conference at that time was Dr. Jabez Bunting, between whom and Mr. Everett there existed ill-concealed dislike. In the opinion of Mr. Everett, the Doctor was substituting Buntingism for Wesleyanism as the rule of the connection. Dr. Bunting probably esteemed Mr. Everett a factious malcontent. A great deal of unpleasantness arose. Anonymous attacks upon the Conference were freely dispersed throughout the country, which, rightly or wrongly, were attributed to Everett and his friends. While, however, we absolutely refrain from any judgment on the points at issue, we cannot, in the interests of justice and freedom, but condemn the arbitrary methods by which the expulsion of Everett and his partisans were brought about. It is not pretended that there was any charge of immorality against them; nor, again, of their holding any opinion subversive of the Christian faith: the utmost alleged was the management of the affairs of the Society had been freely and unfavourably criticised in anonymous publications. To ascertain the authors, searching questions were circulated among the different members,

Digitized by Google

and when by this process the number of suspected persons was limited, yet more searching queries were put, whereby the parties, if guilty, would be compelled to incriminate themselves. Finally, in the Conference, Mr. Everett especially was compelled to declare whether he was or was not the author of the obnoxious publications termed "Fly-sheets;" and upon his refusal to answer, with however a declared readiness on his part to meet any charge, at any time, or in any place, upon refusal, he and his sympathizers were forthwith expelled. We do not know to what extent an individual surrenders his birthrights as an Englishman when he joins the Wesleyan body, but we are quite sure that if the foregoing proceeding had been the act of our Lower House of Convocation, which in the days of William or Anne it might have been,—or if, again, it had been the act of Romish authorities, dealing with recalcitrant ecclesiastics,—in either case it would have afforded matter of free comment to the outside public. It is highly probable that by the sharp expulsion of Mr. Everett and those who sympathized with him, peace was restored to Wesleyanism, though at a serious cost. But there are some remedies which are more serious than disease, and we are not sure that such a remedy as this is not one of them. There must have been a sharp reminder that freedom of criticism upon the acts of ecclesiastical superiors was only permissible within certain limits, and that independence of judgment must, especially in the case of younger men, be a somewhat hazardous responsibility. Even at the cost of much that is distressing and even wrong, we do not wish to see this reproduced in the Church of England.

Meanwhile it may be some (though perhaps a meagre) consolation to many to know that other ecclesiastical bodies have to go through troubles and difficulties as well as the Church, and that all is not peace within their borders. But the fact is so, and that to an extent of which few are conscious, unless intimately acquainted with the subject. A perusal of Mr. Everett's book, detailing struggles in so well compacted a body as Methodism, in this respect may be salutary. Peace and unity are with many fond dreams. They do not realize them in the Church; and are perpetually wandering forth,—some to Rome, some to Plymouthism,—in search of them. The bomb-shell, which Mr. Gladstone has exploded in the midst of the Church of Rome, has, by its lurid light, flashed a glimpse upon the heart-burnings and jealousies tormenting Romanists. Some years ago an ingenuous youth in pursuit of Christian unity sought it with the Plymouth Brethren. A shrewd friend asked him which sect of them he had joined. He was utterly unaware that Oxford street was a Rubicon parting hostile camps fulminating excom-

Digitized by Google

munications against each other. But the die had been cast. He may have found unity in the particular section to which he had attached himself; but we doubt it.

It is impossible that we can avoid viewing this question in relation to our own present difficulties. We have now more than enough who are troubling our Zion, and whom we have no hesitation to say we would be very glad to be rid of, believing that the loss of them would be unspeakable gain to the Church. But if it was in our power (which fortunately it is not) to eject them from our society, as Mr. Everett and his friends were ejected, would we wish to do so? Most assuredly not, at whatever risk of present and future confusion: even if we could pack a court of ecclesiastics to condemn, we would refrain from doing so. There is the law: it is slow; it is expensive; we were about to add that it is uncertain: but still it is the bulwark of religious freedom in our land. It stands between the oppressor and the oppressed; between the mighty and the weak; between the popular and the unpopular. Those who are condemned by it are not required to criminate themselves: they have an impartial hearing; they have a favourable construction put as far as possible upon their acts; and if their wrong-doing has been patent and inexcusable, public opinion ratifies the sentence of the courts. Thus the cause of truth slowly but surely gains ground, and evils are eventually dispelled. We prefer this deliberately to the short, sharp practice of the Wesleyan Conference, and with all the respect for that eminent body we feel sure that our preference is just.

And now we part from this book. We have commented freely upon its peculiarities, which really mar it. In the course of his life, Mr. Everett came across a few celebrities, such as Southey, James Montgomery, Ebenezer Elliott, and some others known to fame, as well as the great lights of Methodism. Some racy or edifying anecdotes concerning them, especially the chief of the latter, would have been a great charm to the volume; but an appraisement of the bulk and colour of a number of rural solicitors and provincial dentists, who interested themselves in Methodism, needs animadversion. We do not doubt that Mr. Everett was an excellent and intelligent man, who by dint of most honourable exertions raised himself to fair eminence; and probably he received hard measure from his co-religionists. But the moral of the book to us seems to be, that if a man must needs think for himself and act upon his convictions, he is as likely to find reasonable opportunity for doing so in the Church of England as in any other religious body we are acquainted with. We may add, too, that with the abundant facilities now provided for superior education, especially in connection with religion,

Digitized by Google

it is the fault of any young man, whose spirit is stirred within him for the work of the ministry, if he does not enjoy advantages which Mr. Everett never did command, and if he does not find himself in a haven of comparative peace, which Mr. Everett never reached.

IN MEMORIAM.—DEAN CHAMPNEYS.

"The memory of the just is blessed."

If there be one more than another of whom this holds good, we think it is that holy man, and diligent servant of his Master, William Weldon Champneys, lately taken to his rest. Very fragrant is his memory. So sweet and beautiful was his life, that it seemed to those associated with him to impart a hallowing fragrance to the moral atmosphere they breathed with him; and now that he has gone from them, the pleasant savour of it lingers yet around them with soft and soothing influence. We are conscious, indeed, of a certain sadness when the thought comes home to us that we shall see his beloved face no more; yet is it a sadness without any, the slightest, touch of sting or bitterness in it; so entirely do we feel that his pure spirit has simply passed away into a purer region, where away from the home in the body he rests from his labours, at home with the Lord he loved and longed for.

William Weldon Champneys was born in the year 1808, and had consequently attained to his sixty-seventh year when he died. In the earlier part of his ministerial life he was subject to an indisposition that caused his friends some anxiety; but in later life he seemed to become stronger; and only recently, when he came up to London to preach in his old church at Whitechapel, on the last Sunday of its remaining open, he appeared remarkably well. To many therefore his death has come with somewhat of the shock of a sudden one. It would perhaps be difficult to find another instance of a life into which so much of busy activity was crowded as in that of this good and earnest man. The talents given to him were indeed put out to holy usury. Very early in life his Lord's command was deeply laid upon his heart: "Occupy till I come." We well remember him as curate of St. Ebbe's, Oxford, full of loving energy and winning power,—drawing men's hearts to himself, and so to the Saviour, by the attraction of gentleness and goodness, and causing them to glorify God in him. It was during his occupancy of this curacy that there sprang up a fierce democratic and almost infidel spirit among the artisans and half-educated classes; and

Digitized by Google

nowhere perhaps was this more rampant than in the parish of St. Ebbe. But even upon these, though they would not enter the church to hear the preacher, the active benevolence of the pastor, as he moved in and out among them, and the beauty of his character, as exhibited before them, exercised an ameliorating influence. To abuse the parsons was a thing of course with them; only it was half amusing, half touching, to hear them make an exception of the parson in their own parish. "Ah, he is a good man!" they would say. It was at St. Ebbe's that Mr. Champneys first exhibited that wonderful talent for teaching children by catechization, which in him was almost unique. We never knew anyone so successful in winning and retaining the attention of the young, and in conveying information to them while he seemed to be drawing it out from them. It was also at St. Ebbe's that that tact and management and organizing capacity were exhibited on a small scale, which subsequently were so remarkably and potently developed in a wider sphere. But it was the same man at Whitechapel that had been at St. Ebbe's; only with a larger field of action, and under greater urgencies to call out the exercise of his peculiar gifts. Marvellous, in truth, was what, under God's blessing, he was able to accomplish in the huge parish to which he was appointed in 1837. On taking charge, he found a population of about 35,000, with only one church, capable indeed of holding nearly 2,000 people, but ordinarily attended by a morning congregation of less than 100. There was no evening service; but a lecturer came and preached in the afternoon. Within a year of Mr. Champneys' arrival, the parish church was filled with an attentive audience, morning and evening; besides which, a considerable congregation attended a service which he held on Sunday afternoons, in the spacious National school-room. The enlargement and success which attended his ministry in this his first year, proved to be the pledge and earnest, under the Divine blessing, of the progress and development that were to follow,—in the erection of additional churches, in the multiplication of schools of various kinds, and in the creation of manifold appliances for the spiritual and temporal well-being of the people committed to his charge.

Mr. Champneys was not a man of high intellectual power, or of profound erudition; but he was surpassed by none in administrative capacity, as a parish priest, and in the talent for organizing and working parochial machinery. Both in his preaching and writings it was the sincere milk of the Word that abounded, rather than its strong meat. He did not take the minds of men by storm, but he could marvellously woo and win and captivate their hearts. The mind that was in Christ Jesus dwelt manifestly in him, and shone forth in his

Digitized by Google

countenance and words and demeanour. This constituted the great beauty of the man, and was the secret of his influence for good. The love of the Saviour intensely constrained him, combined with most tender yearning for the souls for which that Saviour died. The life he lived in the flesh was indeed by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave Himself for him.

We need scarcely say that Mr. Champneys was associated with the great Evangelical body in the Church of England, towards which at an early period of his career he became drawn. His, however, was too truly a catholic mind to be restricted in its sympathies to any one school. Wherever he saw a good work being done, he rejoiced over it, by whomsoever done. At the same time his catholicity did not render him indifferent to error of opinion or of practice. He knew when to set his face like a flint for the truth, and to plant his foot firmly in righteous antagonism. He did not, therefore, hesitate to take up a decided line of action in resistance of modern Ritualism, though there were many on that side for whom he entertained a most kindly personal regard. Toleration, with him, was no weakly compromise of principle on the one hand, while on the other hand, faithfulness to principle engendered no bitterness of spirit.

In the wise providence of God it happened to Mr. Champneys to undergo some severe anxieties and troubles. Perhaps, the very bitterest of these was the suit against his parishioners of Whitechapel, in which he had to appear as plaintiff in support of the rights of the living. The suit was really instituted by the College which held the patronage; but it could not be carried on except in his name, as the Rector holding the incumbency. Only a strong sense of duty availed to overcome his reluctance to adopt this course; and we have reason to know that it cost him acute suffering. But in this, as in other sore trials, he found a strength better than his own, and was enabled to come out of them chastened and purified.

As we thus write of our departed friend numerous incidents crowd upon our recollection illustrative of his character as we have endeavoured to sketch it. But these belong to a more extended memoir, such as we presume will be written. We will, therefore, only add, in conclusion, that as he was beloved in his life, so he was honoured in his death. It is remarkable that his old church at Whitechapel, which is even now in process of demolition, can hardly be said to survive him. From Whitechapel and from St. Pancras many followed him to his grave. The Cathedral was filled with multitudes, from the rich even to the very poorest, as the funeral procession passed onwards; for he was much beloved in Lichfield, as elsewhere, by all classes and

Digitized by Google

conditions of men. In a simple grave, "outside at the south-eastern door of the cathedral," his body rests, awaiting the resurrection of the just. At the close of the service the choir sang his favourite hymn,—

"Lord, it belongs not to my care,
Whether I die or live;
To love and serve Thee is my share,
And that Thy grace must give."

Guardian, Feb. 17th, 1875.

Lord, give us grace to be followers of him as he was of Christ.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A Selection from the Words and Works of our Lord Jesus Christ. By A. B. S. London: Hunt. 1875.—This is a very singular book. It comprises the substance of the Four Gospels in the words of the Evangelists, broken into small portions, to each of which an appropriate and suggestive heading is prefixed. The object is to arrest attention on the particular passage which is to form the subject of morning meditation. As it is all exclusively Holy Scripture it is a good book, and it is very probable that in the case of many persons it may be a way to the more profitable study of Scripture; but we own to a preference for the Word of God in its entirety. It is hard to say what fragment of it may not flash conviction to some soul, or bring comfort to some heart. The book presents itself in a most attractive form, so far as type and ornamentation goes. It is introduced by a preface from Mr. Wilkinson, of Eaton Square, for whose charities the profits are intended.

Sketches of Old Times and Distant Places. By John Sinclair, M.A., Archdeacon of Middlesex, etc. London: Murray. 1875.—We do not suppose that it was the intention of Archdeacon Sinclair to enter the lists with Dean Ramsay. If so we should have been constrained to record "*impar congressus.*" But apart from this association which springs up almost involuntarily, we can congratulate him on having produced a very pleasant volume, containing some agreeable reminiscences of persons, Scotchmen especially, eminent in their day and generation. In the sketch of the Rev. Archibald Alison there are sundry anecdotes of a very interesting character which well deserve recording. We do not think it fair to extract them. From the account of Dr. Chalmers we venture to cull one story which all who have ever had to do with public speaking will fully appreciate. The Doctor, it seems, dreaded more than anything else to have to make an after-dinner speech. "Everything," he said, "depends upon a good thing occurring to you *just as you are rising, and if nothing occurs, what is to become of you?* Even so singular a master of such oratory as Bishop Wilberforce felt the force of it." "Do repeat me that story; it will help me greatly in an emergency." Another

Digitized by Google

clever *jeu d'esprit* is told of a very strange character, a Mr. Bosvile, a relation of the Archdeacon's. He imagined a series of bulletins about the then Pope. First, "His Holiness is very ill;" next, "His Excellency is worse;" then the startling announcement, "His Infallibility is delirious!" The account of David Hume, whose manuscripts were entrusted to the Archdeacon for perusal, will be read with advantage to the confirmation of faith. "Such feelings of depression, after months of studying the green box containing the bequest of Baron Hume!" There is a letter quoted from, written by the Comte de Crutz to Hume. The Count had been visiting Voltaire at Furney. The "illustre vieillard," as he terms him, "desire et ne jouit de rien." "Il voit la mort avancer, a grand pas, et l'idée de la destruction le désole." Those who are interested in the education question, and who amongst our readers is not, will find an interesting account of the earlier struggles between the Ecclesiastical authorities and the State, when the question was first being urged upon public attention. It is a valuable contribution from a well-informed source, for the Archdeacon was Secretary to the National Society, in succession to Bishop Wigram. To the history of this important matter we hope he will, out of the materials still in his possession, supply hereafter a fuller narrative of the earlier progress of national education. It will be seen that there is much to interest the general reader in the Archdeacon's jottings and memoranda.

Quiet Thoughts. By Martha Careful. Second edition. London: Nisbet. 1875.—As this choice little volume has reached a second edition it will not need any special recommendation from us, but it is a pleasant addition to what may be termed domestic religious literature, and we are glad to bring it under notice. In earlier life, the author, under the title of Martha Careful, had busied herself with counsels to young housekeepers; now, with advancing years, she would say a word to awaken more serious reflection, and she has managed it effectively.

The Story of a Fellow Soldier. By Frances Awdry. London: Macmillan. 1875.—This is the story of that holy and devoted man, Bishop Patteson. We have been forward to recognise the claim he has upon the veneration of Christian people, for he was "in labours more abundant," and shrank not from any proof of his being a true minister of Christ. The present volume is a resumé, no doubt, especially intended for young readers of Miss Patteson's more full biography. We do not perceive that any fresh information is communicated, but the story is pleasantly told, and will help to popularize the narrative of a life which ought never to be forgotten, for in it true Christian chivalry was most nobly exemplified. We hope it will meet with extensive circulation. There are several illustrations.

Aids to the Study of German Theology. Edinburgh: Clark. 1874. —To ordinary readers, even including many clerical, few things are probably more mysterious than German theology. The name to them is one of evil import: they shudder and pass it by. Kant, Schlieermacher, Fichte, Hegel, Strauss, represent to them various

Digitized by Google

types of heresy and blasphemy, but what is the precise nature of their opinions few care to understand. We may add, that if they did make the attempt and walked into the shifting bogs before them, they would only cover themselves with mire and dirt. And yet it is not well to be ignorant of the views and conclusions of the eminent thinkers who have swayed the intellect of Germany during the past century. It may be that the conclusions to which they have come have been disastrous and deplorable; still a certain amount of familiarity with them is, we will not say essential, but convenient. In this small volume which Messrs. Clark have published, the opinions of the leading German philosophers on theology are presented, divested of their peculiar and repellent terminology, in a manner sufficiently intelligible to Englishmen. Any one gifted with ordinary intelligence may gather out of it the chief tenets of the leading spirits of Germany, and find himself fairly informed upon the subject. Indeed this will we think be found to be the principal use of the book, for the student will require more. The writer or compiler deserves high praise for the clear manner in which he has in a brief compass stated these opinions, noticing at the same time the force and weakness of them.

The Last Days of Shiloh. By J. Radcliffe, London: Longmans. 1874.—*Sacred Lyrics. By Henry Lockwood. London: Kerby.* 1874. —Nineteen hundred years ago, when oracles were yet scarcely dumb, it was solemnly declared that there is one thing from which poets are interdicted,—mediocrity. The common consent of the human race has since ratified the stern decree, and on the banks of Lethe the contraveners of it waste unpitied, darkness burying all. Still mediocre poets abound. In many cases youth and inexperience form an undue estimate of themselves; often the injudicious flattery of friends tempts to a mistake. We cannot say that the volumes before us present any exception to or rise above the multitudinous throng of aspirants to fame whose doom will be disappointment. Mr. Radcliffe has attempted to do for the Bible what Lord Macaulay did for the history of Rome. But he cannot bend the bow of Ulysses. We must rather praise the ingenuity of the idea than the execution of it. Occasionally there is a faint echo of the stirring voice of Macaulay, which makes the volume somewhat readable, but there are many most dreary lines of bathos to be endured. In the "Death Song of Samson," where the subject recalls Milton, and Mr. Radcliffe's verse Campbell, in his "Gertrude of Wyoming," we have,

> "Till, sleeping on her wonted lap
> I woke: and lo, my head was bare!
> I looked: the treacherous drab was gone,
> And Philistines were standing there."

Further on he speaks of the pillars "wabbling at his will." So did not Milton. Mr. Lockwood's volume is precisely of the same character as Mr. Radcliffe's. It is less pretentious, and in many parts is little more than a versification of Scripture. There is no harm in either of these volumes, but we can say little more or else.

Digitized by Google

Sketches and Studies Descriptive and Historical. By Richard John King, B.A., Author of "Handbook of Cathedrals of England and Wales." London: Murray. 1874.—These essays have appeared from time to time in different magazines, such as the *Quarterly Review*, *Fraser's*, etc. We are quite, however, of opinion that they deserve being rescued from the oblivion into which anonymous contributions to periodicals usually fall, for there is a great deal of pleasant and valuable information in them. The articles are of a very miscellaneous character, treating of chivalry, mediæval superstitions, Iceland and its change from heathenism to Christianity; but Ecclesiastical antiquities and Devonshire are evidently Mr. King's especial delight, and upon them he dilates with peculiar enthusiasm. We cannot compliment him much upon charm of style. Often it has seemed to us that his information might have been presented in a more attractive form; but there is a great deal of quaint and recondite learning, which will have charms for intelligent readers. Read in the winter evening by the fire-side the volume stirs an anxious feeling that the storm and the cold might quickly pass away, and that it would soon be possible to go forth to the enjoyment of the sylvan scenery and the sequestered nooks, rich with antiquarian remains, upon which Mr. King dwells with so much thorough enjoyment. In his "Travelling in England"—a most pleasant disquisition—he urges spring as the time for moving about in England, which was the fashion of our ancestors. It may be so for the young and lusty, but spring marches too closely upon winter for persons of more mature age. There are many who shudder at an east wind, and shrink from going or moving with the snow upon the ground. We commend this essay especially to those who may be glad to know what a wealth of historical and poetical interest our native land affords to those who traverse it with the advantage of culture and intelligence. Not that Mr. King is insensible to the attractions of foreign cities, as his careful studies of some of the chief Flemish towns attest. We can vouch for the careful accuracy which they display.

Cause and Effect; or, Has God Forsaken the Earth? By a Student of Nature. London: Hamilton, Brown. 1875.—A clever pamphlet, well worth perusal. The object of the writer is to contend that God condescends to be the Executor of His own laws; this the writer seeks to demonstrate "without the aid of that revelation which to many minds in this 'our enlightened' age carries so little weight." The writer adduces several instances from nature in support of his proposition which fairly commend themselves to the serious attention of thoughtful minds. It will be convenient for those who have to deal with sceptics to be furnished with two or three striking instances difficult of refutation.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

PARLIAMENT has met again, on the 5th ultimo. It was not opened by Her Majesty in person, as at the time her anxiety for her son, Prince Leopold, was great. We can record with thankfulness the convalescence of the Prince. Her Majesty's speech was conceived in a hopeful strain as to the prospect of national peace and prosperity,—prosperity in which her colonial empire has largely shared. Even from India Her Majesty could report the blessing of an abundant harvest, and the success of the measures employed to avert famine. More space than is usual in such addresses is devoted to outlying portions of the empire; as, for instance, the Gold Coast, the Fiji Islands, and the Colony of Natal, to which, we observe, Sir Garnet Wolsely has since been despatched as a special Commissioner. Many measures for the promotion of social and legal reforms are promised, which open out to our Legislature a field for practical usefulness, which we trust they will devote themselves to with energy and success.

There has been considerable discussion in the Liberal party as to who should be selected as leader in the room of Mr. Gladstone. The claims of the Marquis of Hartington and Mr. Forster were urged with much vigour, but the fierce animosity of the "secular" dissenters was so intense that Mr. Forster withdrew his candidature, and the Marquis now holds the anxious and somewhat forlorn position. John Mitchel, an "escaped felon," has been returned for Tipperary, but has been refused admission to the House of Commons.

Out of Parliament Mr. Bright has addressed his constituents at Birmingham. The staple of his harangue which, on the admission even of his friends, was intellectually, as we fear it was physically, a failure, was an attack on the Church of England. It differed so little in substance or in power from the ordinary diatribes against the Church that it does not require any special notice. The present barrenness of the party to which Mr. Bright belongs is most evident from the inability of a man so eminent to discover any better topic for discourse than a "railing accusation" against a Church to which he does not belong. It will not add to a reputation which seems to have culminated and to be on the decline.

We turn to a more grateful subject. During the month last past a conference of Evangelical members of the Church of England was held in London, at the Cannon Street Hotel, under the presidency of Prebendary Auriol. The meetings were thronged, and the interest never flagged from the beginning to the end. It was a "holy solemnity," profitable in the extreme

Digitized by Google

to the soul. None of the petty and well nigh degrading subjects which are agitating the Church at the present moment, about postures and vestments, and similar trumpery, were under debate. These are evil machinations which need to be resisted to the uttermost. But higher and holier thoughts filled the minds and occupied the attention of the assembled multitude. Questions intimately affecting the standing, the course, the prospects of the believer, were most judiciously handled by experienced brethren, in a most loving and sober spirit. It was singularly a conference for mutual edification, and many must indeed have felt it good to have been there. No one could have been present and have listened to what fell from the successive speakers without feeling what firm hold the truth, as it is in Jesus, has upon the hearts and consciences of the clergy, as well as laity, of the Evangelical portion of the Church of England. There was nothing to be desiderated either in power or in clearness and truthfulness of statement. We would put it earnestly to our friends whether it is not in gatherings such as these, where, as "iron sharpeneth iron so a man his friend," under the competent management of recognized leaders, that Evangelical men should rally their strength. There has been much specious argumentation as to the policy of attending Church Congresses and similar mixed bodies. It has been said that it is wise to display the capacity of Evangelical men to hold their own with the mightiest and most learned. To our mind all this has savoured somewhat of the wisdom of Hezekiah, in displaying all that was found in his treasures. The unity attained in these meetings, when there is unity, results from compromise; moreover, as recently at Brighton, it was manifest that erroneous statements revolting to Evangelical men were thrust upon the meeting, without the power or opportunity being afforded for refutation, through the influence of the sacerdotal party. It does harm to the laity especially to see Evangelical men, whom they look up to, vainly struggling against the enunciations of falsehood. We earnestly hope that the recent success in London will lead those with whom the decision rests to reconsider their course, and seriously to debate whether it is not true wisdom to abstain from meetings where they may be allowed to prattle with impunity upon matters which nobody cares to contravert; but where they are liable to be crushed at any moment by the high hand of authority, if they would venture manfully to protest against the darling errors of the day. It is our belief that if Evangelical Churchmen had resolutely withheld their countenance and co-operation, Church Congresses would not have been the serious danger to the Church of England which recent experience shows that they may develope into.

Digitized by Google

In France there has been much political agitation, chiefly in the Assembly. By a majority of one, on the proposition of a deputy, M. Wallon, a republic was voted. By a further vote, on the proposition of the same deputy, the right of dissolving the Assembly was granted to the President of the Republic for the time being. This was voted by a majority of eight, and confirmed the previous decision. As we write, these important questions have not met with a definite solution, but are indications of the future. Fear of the Bonapartist reaction has precipitated these results.

In Italy, Garibaldi has left his island, and is now domiciled in Rome, where he seems inclined to act in a moderate and patriotic spirit, devoting his attention to important questions of drainage, and those material improvements which may prove so advantageous to a fertile but neglected country like Italy. The Pope has so far quitted his seclusion that he has visited St. Peter's, and has claimed for Rome that she is "Babylon." *Habemus confitentem.*

The various Governments of Europe are recognising King Alfonso, and Spain is apparently settling down into something like quietness and order, but the Carlist excesses have not yet terminated.

The Emperor of China is dead, and is succeeded by a child five years old. He comes to the throne in troublous times for the vast empire over which he is to be the nominal ruler.

Unpleasant news has reached England from our Protectorate on the Gold Coast, in which it is plain that slavery still exists. Strenuous opposition is likely to be made to the efforts for its abolition; but plainly it is not to be endured that slavery should be the normal condition of multitudes within the limits of the British empire.

We have adverted elsewhere to the loss which the Church has sustained by the death of Dean Champneys. Lord St. Leonards, Sir Charles Lyell, and the novelist Charles Kingsley, are also numbered among the dead.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limitted period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the reduced price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 4. APRIL. [1875.

THE BELIEVER'S STANDING.

[Upon this important subject the first paper at the recent Cannon Street Conference was read by the Rev. Canon Hoare. At the request of many important friends we gladly preserve it in our pages.]

THE great object of our Conference is Scriptural holiness, and I think that those who have made the arrangements have acted very wisely in putting the "Believer's Standing" in the forefront of their lists of subjects; for unless there be a sure standing-ground there is very little hope of satisfactory progress. Before David's goings could be established, and a new song put in his mouth, even thanksgiving to our God, God took him out of the pit, and set his feet on a rock. When firmly placed on the rock he could walk, not only steadily, but so joyfully that his happy and holy influence became the means of the ingathering of souls. "Many shall see it and fear, and put their trust in the Lord."

It is my business this morning to consider the rock on which God places us; not the goings or the song, but the rock itself on which God places His servants. What is it on which, as believers on the Lord Jesus Christ, we are standing? That, I apprehend, is the question for this morning, and I pray God we may not only understand His truth, but know in the experience of our own souls what it is to have our goings established on the Rock.

In answer to the question, "What is the rock?" our minds all naturally turn to the words of St. Paul, "That Rock was Christ." But I cannot quote that passage as a proof-text, for it does not refer to the Rock on which we stand, but to that from which the water flowed in the wilderness. But the words that do decide the point are those spoken by our Lord to St. Peter, when Peter said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and our Lord declared, "On this Rock I build my Church."

Digitized by Google

"The Christ, the Son of the living God," is, therefore, the Rock on which we stand; the Rock into which every stone of His Church must be built by the Holy Ghost, if it is to remain unshaken through the storms of life.

But this answer that the Rock is the Son of God does not in practice fully meet the question, and, if we are to know our own resting-place or standing-ground, we must not be content with the statement, but look somewhat more closely into it. Let us refer, generally then, to Rom. v. 2 and its immediate context, a passage which I think will throw great light on the subject. We there read, "By whom also we have," or have had (ἐσχήκαμεν), "access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." These words describe us as having been brought to a new standing-ground, and now standing there. They teach us also that this standing-ground is a grace, or a gift (*την χαρὶν ταύτην*), a gift well known and acknowledged. And there are two questions which appear to me to be suggested by the passage: First, What is the grace to which the Apostle here refers, the grace in which we stand? and, secondly, On what offices of the Lord Jesus Christ does that grace itself depend?

I. What is the grace? Of course we are all aware that the word "grace" has different meanings in Holy Scripture. Sometimes it means the inward work of the Holy Ghost in the soul, —that in which we are to grow, as St. Peter taught us, when he said, "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." This, however, cannot be a sure standing ground, for if it were, there would be no need of growth. But this is not the only meaning of the word, or nearly so. It stands for any great gift of love and mercy, bestowed through God's free favour on His people. As, for example, when St. Paul said (Ephes. iii. 8), "Unto me that am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." We have therefore to consider what is the free gift or favour into which we have had access, and in which we now stand? In answer to this question, after most careful and prayerful study of the context, I have not the smallest hesitation in replying that this grace is *imputed righteousness.*

The only way of really understanding an expression like this is to study the context, and the argument in which it stands. Now I think it must be perfectly plain to any careful reader of the fourth chapter, that the one object of that chapter is to prove, from the cases of Abraham and David, the doctrine of justification through imputed righteousness. Nothing can be clearer than the language of ver. 2—5: "If Abraham were justified by works he hath whereof to glory," "but not before God:"

Digitized by Google

—that is, he was not so justified according to God's Word. For what saith the Scripture? "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." The Apostle then proceeds to show that if this gift of imputed righteousness were bestowed as the result of works, it would not be of grace; and that as it is of grace, it was therefore bestowed through faith. "Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." With reference, therefore, to Abraham, there are two points established: that he was justified by imputed righteousness; and that this righteousness was imputed to him by grace through faith.

The case of David is not so fully argued out, as there is nothing said of the grace or the faith. The Apostle is satisfied with proving the imputation of righteousness and the non-imputation of sin (ver. 6—8): "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputed righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Well, indeed, might He declare them blessed! What can be more blessed than to be reckoned righteous, and that even in God's sight, when we know what we are even in our own?

The next nine verses of the chapter contain a proof that we Gentiles are admitted, or have access to the same sacred gift. They are an answer to the question, "Cometh this blessedness on the circumcision only, or on the uncircumcision also?" After which follows the grand description of Abraham's faith, in which it is said, "He was fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform," all leading back to the original conclusion of the third verse, "And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness." But now observe the extension of the principle to ourselves in the next verse: "Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed if we believe on Him that raised our Lord from the dead." That great statement respecting Abraham is intended also for us. Like him, we are to be justified through imputed righteousness bestowed in grace and received in faith: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." Can there be a doubt that the grace wherein we stand is the same as that wherein Abraham stood,—a righteousness imputed through the free favour of God?

But we have not yet got to the rock; for that imputed righ-

Digitized by Google

teousness is itself a result. It is not the rock, but like a platform built by God upon the rock, and resting on it. The rock is Christ Himself, and that sacred work of His on which the imputation of righteousness depends. You may see this connection between the righteousness and the rock very clearly taught in those grand words of 2 Cor. v. 21: "He hath made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." The imputation of righteousness rests altogether on His finished work.

II. But now our second question will require consideration. On what offices of our Lord Jesus does this imputed righteousness depend? All fulness dwells in Him; and there is that in Him and His varied offices which is much more than sufficient for every possible want of the human heart. But all His offices are not equally applicable to all parts of the Christian life. Some are most concerned with the foundation, and others with the superstructure; some with our acceptance, and others with our personal holiness and progress. It behoves us, therefore, to examine with care on which of His offices the imputation of righteousness depends. Now I believe that the whole of His saving work may be arranged in two great divisions, as expressed by the words, "Christ *for* us," and "Christ *in* us;" and we have to examine which of these two is the rock on which we stand. Is it "Christ *for* us?" or is it "Christ *in* us?" or is it both combined? There can be no doubt that when we stand glorified before the throne, accepted in Him and transformed into His likeness, the power in us will be as perfectly manifested as the power for us, and there will be no need then to attempt to define the difference. There can be no doubt, again, that if we are now fruit-producing believers, "always abounding in the work of the Lord," the fruitfulness depends entirely on Christ *in* us; for the distinction between the fruitful and the barren branches of the vine is, that our Lord Jesus is not in the fruitless, but is in the fruitful branches. "He that abideth in Me *and I in him*, the same bringeth forth much fruit." But I believe it is equally beyond any possibility of doubt, that Christ "*for* us," and Christ for us alone, is the one rock on which we stand. When I speak of Christ for us, I do not refer only to His death, but to His whole work as our Representative Head: His incarnation, His death, His resurrection, His acceptance, His ascension, His mediation, His whole work, in short, external to ourselves. It is this work *for* us on which the imputation of righteousness exclusively depends. What can be clearer than the proof from that great passage already referred to, "He hath made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him"? And what can be clearer than the

Digitized by Google

testimony of this passage in the Romans? Does not the last verse of the fourth chapter teach us perfectly clearly that the imputation of righteousness depends on the "for," not on the "in"? "To whom it shall be imputed if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered *for* our offences, and was raised again *for* our justification." Is it not exactly the same in the words of the fifth chapter? In v. 6: "For when we were yet without strength in due time Christ died *for* the ungodly." In v. 8, we read, "God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died *for* us." In v. 9, we read, "Being now justified by His blood,"—not, you mark, by His indwelling,—"we shall be saved from wrath through Him." And to conclude, in v. 18, we read, "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all unto justification of life."

While, therefore, it is perfectly impossible for us to think enough of the sacred privilege of the indwelling of the Lord Jesus Christ within the soul; while our whole hearts are opened by the Holy Ghost to receive Him, and our earnest desire is that He may take full possession of every faculty, and reign without a rival, we must never cease to bear in mind that it is His work for us, and not His work in us, which is the foundation of imputed righteousness, the one rock on which we stand. And who can describe the unspeakable blessedness of this great conclusion? It is impossible to imagine the privilege and honour if the Son of God makes our souls His dwelling-place, and makes us "temples of the Holy Ghost." But still the evidences of His indwelling are so mixed with the working of our fallen human heart, that if we had to stand on the evidences of the work within we should find it so difficult to disentangle grace from nature that even when there is a true work of grace it would be unsafe to trust in it. The human heart, even when the Lord Himself dwells there, is not unlike the feet in Nebuchadnezzar's image: part of iron and part of clay,—and who can stand on that? Besides, the very nature of the Lord's work within proves the impossibility of our resting on it as our standing ground. For the first evidence of the Holy Spirit's power is a broken heart with a deep sense of sin; and how shall the broken heart rely on its own experience? I venture to maintain that if "Christ *in* us" were the believer's standing ground, a broken heart could never be at peace. The work of the Holy Ghost would itself break up the trust.

But now that it is Christ *for* us on which we stand, the whole case is different. In that Rock there is no clay. In that Foundation there are no weak points. It is throughout the work

Digitized by Google

of God, and "as for God, His work is perfect." We may tremble on the Rock, but the Rock will never tremble under us. There is no admixture of human defect in the perfection of our representative Head. The righteousness which He imputes is not a mixed thing, like the holiness in our own hearts, for it is the "righteousness of God." And the foundation of the imputation is not a weak, varying element, as everything is that we find within, but it rests on the great, grand, fixed, eternal covenant of God,—on the covenant by which "the Lamb" was "slain before the foundation of the world," on God's own plan, God's own work, God's own promise, the eternal purpose of God Himself. That never varies and that never fails. It is suited to all times and all circumstances. In the hour of joy it gives a solid substance to our happiness, and in the hour of trouble it is not pulled down by our depression. It is just as trustworthy when the heart is broken as when it is rejoicing in Divine emotion. It remains fixed, external to ourselves, unchangeable for ever in the covenant of God. Most heartily, then, shall we all unite in the grand old words of Hooker: "Let it be counted folly, or frenzy, or fury, whatsoever, it is our comfort and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this,—that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of man, and that men are made the righteousness of God."

THE RITUAL CONTROVERSY.

The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Published for the Surtees Society. Two vols. Whittaker and Co. 1872.

Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer from Manuscript Sources. Bishop Sanderson and Bishop Wren. Edited by William Jacobson, D.D., Bishop of Chester. Murray. 1874.

Worship in the Church of England. By A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P. Murray. 1874.

The Form and Order of the Consecration and Ddication of the Parish Church of Abbey Dore. Pickering. 1874.

Fasting Communion; Non-Communicating Attendance; Auricular Confession; the Doctrine of Sacrifice; the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Being an Appendix to the Author's Commentary on "The Office of the Holy Communion." By Edward Meyrich Goulburn, D.C.L., D.D., Dean of Norwich. Rivingtons. 1874.

Digitized by Google

Ritual Revision. A Letter to the Ven. Edward Bickersteth, D.D. By the Right Hon. John G. Hubbard, M.P. Longmans. 1874.

Letters to the Very Rev. the Deans of York, St. Paul's, Manchester. By William Selwyn, D.D., Canon of Ely. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1874.

Eucharistic Vestments and the Eastward Position. By the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, M.A. Hatchards. 1874.

The Lord's Table, Vestments, and the Eastward Position. A Letter to a Layman. By the Dean of Chester. Hatchards. 1875.

The Position of the Celebrant at the Holy Communion. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Winchester. By Morton Shaw, M.A. Rivingtons. 1875.

The Rubrical Question of 1874. *A Brief Historical Inquiry, etc. By C. A. Swainson, D.D., Canon of Chichester. Second edition. Bell and Sons.* 1875.

Notes Concerning the Position of the Minister during the Celebration of the Holy Communion. Northampton: Stanton. 1874.

A Few Words about the Eastward Position. By the Rev. Arthur Wolfe, M.A., Rector of Fornham all Saints, and of Westley, Bury St. Edmund's. Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1875.

We have placed at the head of this paper the titles of several works bearing upon the ritual controversies of the present day, many of which "owe their immediate origin," to adopt the words of Mr. Beresford Hope, "to the incidents of the last Parliamentary Session," and are, on that account, to a certain extent, of an ephemeral character. Some, however, are of an earlier date; and, some, whatever the circumstances which gave rise to their production, are works of general interest, and of permanent value.

The first of these works to which we shall direct the attention of our readers is that entitled "Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer from Manuscript Sources." We are indebted for this valuable contribution to our Liturgical literature to the present Bishop of Chester, the learned Editor of the works of Bishop Sanderson. This work consists of two portions. The former portion contains Bishop Sanderson's Common Prayer-book, designed for personal use during the Commonwealth, as set forth in a MS. recently discovered in the Library of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and now first published by permission of the Dean and Chapter. The second portion contains some Remarks on the Book of Common Prayer by Bishop Wren, contained in a MS. volume presented to Bishop Jacobson by the late Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury, whose father received it from Dr. Terrich, Bishop of London, 1764—1777.

Digitized by Google

The fact that Bishop Sanderson's Prayer-book was designed for his own personal use at a time at which the use of the Book of Common Prayer was strictly interdicted, and at which he, in common with other eminent divines, deemed a variation from the strict observance of the Rubric lawful, deprives this volume of much of that interest which it would otherwise have possessed, as illustrating the views of one who occupied an important position both in the Savoy Conference and also in the final Revision of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661. This volume, however, is not altogether devoid of interest and importance in connection with the present Eucharistic controversy, inasmuch as it contains several expressions which appear to us to afford conclusive evidence of the general character of Bishop Sanderson's creed on the subject of the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion. We will briefly refer to some of them.[a]

(1) In the general "Instruction" prepared for use at the time when the congregation were assembled "to eat the Lord's Supper," we find that Bishop Sanderson describes the breaking of our Saviour's body and the shedding of His most precious blood as "*represented*" unto us in this Sacrament. (p. 23.)

(2) The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is said by Bishop Sanderson to have been "ordained by our Saviour Jesus Christ Himself for this end especially,—that the *remembrance* of His death, wherein He offered up Himself a sacrifice for our sins (and the innumerable benefits that we receive thereby), might be the better *remembered* in the Christian Church to all succeeding generations." The special significance of these words, as showing the sense in which Bishop Sanderson interpreted our Saviour's command, "Do this in remembrance of Me," will be more clearly perceived when they are contrasted, as Bishop Jacobson has done in his Preface (p. vii.), with those of Bishop Wren, in which the latter interprets 1 Cor. xi. 26 as signifying "To put me in mind of you: Christ of us, and not us in mind of Him." (See p. 81.)

(3) In "The Act of Worship" which follows the distribution of the elements, that portion of the former of the two prayers in the Book of Common Prayer, which makes mention of "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and which is, to a great extent, the same as the Prayer of Oblation, which in the Prayer-book of 1549 followed immediately after the Prayer of Consecration, is altogether omitted, whilst the second portion of the prayer, which refers to the sacrifice of "ourselves, our souls and bodies," is retained.

---

[a] We have printed in italics the words to which we direct the particular attention of our readers.

Digitized by Google

We may add further, in regard to Bishop Sanderson's Form for the Administration of Baptism, that whilst the omission of the words having reference to the sign of the cross may be reasonably accounted for on prudential considerations, it seems difficult to reconcile the high sacramental views, now so confidently ascribed to the revisers of 1661, with the facts that the words following upon the reception of the child into the congregation of Christ's flock, in which, in the Prayer-book of 1604, as in that of 1661, the child is pronounced regenerate, are entirely omitted, and so also is the thanksgiving in the Prayer which follows: "That it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit."

Bishop Wren was Chaplain to Bishop Andrewes, and became Dean of Windsor, 1628; Bishop of Hereford, 1635; Bishop of Norwich in the same year; and Bishop of Ely, 1638. At the end of the year 1640, on the day after the impeachment of Archbishop Laud, Bishop Wren was charged with having, "after a Popish and idolatrous manner, stood and officiated at the west side of the Holy Table, with his back to the people. He had insisted on chancel steps, on the Holy Table being placed altarwise, with a rail in front of it, and on pews being altered, so that the people should look to the east. He had enjoined preaching in the surplice, and forbidden sermons in the afternoon and the use of any prayer before the sermon, from a desire to maintain and promote catechizing, and to repress extempore prayer."

Bishop Wren's defence of the eastward position is well known: viz., that "being low of stature, he could not reach over his book if he stood at the north side." It is remarkable, however, and it affords one amongst the many proofs of the extreme singularity of the eastward position in the English Church, that Heylyn, in his life of Archbishop Laud, observes in reference to this charge alleged against Wren, together with that of the elevation of the elements, that "*as they made most noise, so they found least proof.*" [b]

It appears to have been immediately after the consecration of Wren as Bishop of Hereford that Dr. Field, Bishop of St. David's, was engaged, by virtue and authority of a commission from Wren, to consecrate and dedicate the parish church of Abbey Dore, in the county of Hereford. The account of this consecration has been recently published by Mr. Russell, the Rector of Greenhithe, Kent, from a MS. in the British Museum, and the ceremonial observed on this occasion has been triumphantly alleged in justification of modern Ritualistic practices. It is scarcely needful to observe that until some clearer light is thrown

[b] "Cyprianus Anglicus," p. 471. Fol. 1668.

Digitized by Google

upon the history of the composition of this form, it can claim at the utmost, no higher authority than that of Bishop Field, who actually performed the service, and, *possibly*, but, as it should seem, not *probably*, that of Bishop Wren, under whose commission he acted.

In this form the priest and chaplain are described as going, at the beginning of the Communion Office, to the "north part" and to the "south part" of the Table, respectively. The Bishop is described as coming and worshipping "before the Table," and, having first laid certain deeds upon it, and also "offered" the elements, as returning to the seat prepared for him "before the Table, not full in the middle, but towards the north end." The priest appears to have performed the early portion of the Service, including the Prayer for the Church Militant, in which he substitutes the word *oblations* for *alms*,[c] at the north part of the Table. The chaplain going from "the Table's end" (the *end* being thus identified with *part*), "kneels down in the middle, at a convenient distance from the Table," and makes the Confession, and, having done this, goes and kneels by the priest, "behind the Bishop." The Bishop, "kneeling down a little before at the Table," says the prayer, "We do not presume," etc., and then, having first washed his fingers," and poured wine into the chalice "and a little water," and, "*standing with his face to the Table, about the midst of it*, he saith the Collect of Consecration."

We have given, at considerable length, the evidence which Mr. Russell's volume affords in behalf of the Eastern position, and our readers will have but little difficulty in assigning to it its due weight of importance. At a time of general disquietude, Bishop Field, whose name is not generally known as one possessing any weight, acting on behalf of a Bishop recently consecrated, commonly regarded as favourable to Romish innovations, but so far as can be judged from the volume before us, without any direct sanction from him of the observances therein described, performed certain acts, some of which,—as *e.g.*, the insertion of the word *oblations*, and the administration of the Holy Communion to the Founder before the assisting clergy,—were confessedly illegal; others of which,—as the washing of the hands and the admixture of water with the wine,—were confessedly not prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. Amongst these unauthorised rites and ceremonies we find him consecrating in the middle of the Table, at a time when the north and south ends were already occupied by two other clergyman, and when the present rubric prefixed to the Prayer of Consecration did not exist. We think

[c] It must be remembered that the word *oblations* was inserted at the revision of 1661. The insertion then in 1635 was distinctly unauthorized.

Digitized by Google

our readers will agree with us, that those who assign much weight to evidence in favour of the eastward position such as this, must be conscious that the cause which they espouse is one which can ill afford to dispense with the feeblest arguments which can be alleged in its behalf.

On turning to the remarks and suggestions of Bishop Wren, in the Bishop of Chester's interesting volume, we must remember that they were made shortly after his release from severe imprisonment, and under circumstances which are not likely to have disposed him towards concession to the views of his political and religious opponents; and yet, upon the whole, we observe, as the Bishop of Chester has remarked, "not a few indications of willingness to consider and make allowance for popular feeling and prejudice." And if, when we regard the nature of some of Bishop Wren's proposed alterations, we are disposed to think that some of the accusations preferred against him in the year 1641 may not have been altogether of so questionable a character as Heylyn seems to have considered them, we shall not fail to be struck by the wide diversity of opinion which the "Remarks" exhibit from that entertained upon the same topic by the Ritualists of our own days. We will only observe, further, before we notice more of these "Remarks," that although the name of Bishop Wren does not appear amongst those of the Episcopal divines to whom the Royal Warrant was addressed, to take part in the Savoy Conference, he was one of the eight who were appointed in November, 1661, as a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation, for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

The first point to which we shall direct attention, as prominently brought before our notice in the "Remarks," is the extent to which the events of the preceding century had effaced all the ancient landmarks, and the uncertainty in which those Rubrics were involved, even in 1660, which have been the subject of so much debate in our own times.

In regard to the Rubric prescribing the place where Morning and Evening Prayer should be said,—a Rubric which was introduced into the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI.,—Bishop Wren observes: "But who can now tell which place, when this order was made, was the accustomed place?"

Again, in regard to the direction that "the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past," Bishop Wren observes: "Who knows how the chancels were in those times past, so many having since then been demolished and many disused?" This observation, as we shall afterwards see, has a very important bearing upon the position of the Lord's Table, and consequently upon that of the minister, when officiating at it.

Once more, in regard to the celebrated Ornaments Rubric,

Digitized by Google

which has created so much division in our own days, Bishop Wren observes: "The very words, too, of that Act 2, Edward VI., for the minister's ornaments, would be set down, or to pray to have a new one made; for there is somewhat in that Act that now may not be used."

We now come to the remarks upon the Rubrics of the Communion office. The first remark which claims our attention is upon that Rubric which fixes the place of the Communion Table, at the Communion time, either "in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said." The Bishop's remark on this Rubric is, that the words are ambiguous, and the reason assigned is as follows: "Many churches now have no chancels; and in the most that have, though the desk for reading the prayers doth stand in the body of the church, yet they use to go into the chancel to receive the Communion." With all respect for the Bishop, we venture to suggest a doubt whether this Rubric was not more precise than the Bishop desired; inasmuch as it prescribes that the position of the Table, at the Communion time, shall be in that part of the church, *whether chancel or nave*, in which Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said. Now in the first case to which the Bishop refers, viz., that in which there were no chancels, there could be no ambiguity in the Rubric. In those cases, however, in which there were chancels, but in which Morning and Evening Prayer were appointed to be said in the nave, the Rubric unquestionably *allowed*,—and if our construction of its phraseology be correct, *enjoined*,—that the Table, at the time of Communion, should stand in the nave; and consequently, inasmuch as the table-wise position was confessedly the concomitant of its location in the body of the church, that the Table should stand with its ends east and west, and not, as when removed to the east end of the chancel (as Bishop Wren, in 1636, directed that it should stand in all churches within his diocese[d]), with its ends north and south.

In any case, the fact that notwithstanding the "ambiguity," or liberty,—in whichever light we regard it,—this Rubric remained substantially unchanged in the final revision of 1661, is a sufficient proof either that the opinions of Bishop Wren, and of those who shared his views, were not in harmony with the opinions of the majority of the Convocation, or that there were other influences at work which neither he nor they could control, and which prevented the accomplishment of the desired change.

[d] It is remarkable that Laud was content with inquiring whether the Table stood "in a convenient place in the chancel or church," thus merely inverting the order of place recognised by the Rubric from 1552 down to his own time.

Digitized by Google

In regard to the Rubric prefixed to the Communion Office, which prescribes the position of the priest at the beginning of that service, Bishop Wren disposes of the *alleged* ambiguity in it, which has been discovered by our modern Ritualists, by proposing that the priest should stand "at the north of the Table," —a position which it would be difficult even for those whose ingenuity has devised a non-natural interpretation of "north-side," to explain of any part of the west-side of the Table.

The next suggestion which we have to notice, and one which was adopted at the final revision, has reference to the prayer for the Church Militant. That prayer, as Bishop Wren observes, makes mention, in its commencement, of the obligation not only of praying for all, but also of giving thanks for all. Thanksgiving, as well as prayer, was found in the form introduced into the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI. In Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book, however, of 1559,* the Commemoration or Thanksgiving for Saints, which was found in the first Book of King Edward, was omitted, as the Bishop observes, "that the vulgar might not think they did either pray to the dead or for the dead." The reason assigned by the Bishop why the Thanksgiving should be restored, as it actually was, so far from being based, as some would now base it, upon the obligation, or at least the lawfulness of prayer for the dead, is that there was no longer any fear that the language employed could be so interpreted. The Bishop's remark is expressed in the following terms: "*Thanks be to God, there can be no pretence at all now why it should not be restored.*" (p. 77.)

A similar reason to that which Bishop Wren alleges for the re-insertion of words, which had been omitted in the later revisions of the Prayer-book,—viz., that they could no longer be misunderstood,—is urged also by him for the omission of those words which were inserted in King Edward's Second Prayer-book, in regard to non-communicating attendance. Those who allege that the omission of the words which we find in the successive revisions of the Book of Common Prayer up to 1661, in regard to the "gazers and lookers-on," must be considered as a tacit sanction of non-communicating attendance, will do well to consider the reason assigned by Bishop Wren why those words should be withdrawn. His remark is as follows: "To stand by as gazers and lookers-on, *is now wholly out of use in all parishes.*

* Bishop Wren has here fallen into the error of supposing that these words were first omitted in Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book. The fact is that they were omitted in the Second Prayer-book of King Edward. In the Prayer-book of 1549 there was a direct commendation to God's mercy of the departed saints, as well as praise and thanks for them. In the Prayer-book of 1552 both these clauses were omitted.

Digitized by Google

And the non-communicants generally do use to depart without bidding." (p. 78.)

Before we proceed to notice the Rubric prefixed to the Prayer of Consecration, it is important to observe, that according to Bishop Wren's suggestions, the bread and wine were not to be placed upon the table until after the Prayer for the Church Militant, and just before the short prayer, "We do not presume," etc., which immediately precedes the Prayer of Consecration. Whilst this fact serves to throw doubt upon Bishop Wren's connection with the Rubrical directions observed in the consecration of the Church of Abbey Dore, in which particular notice is taken of the "offering" of the elements by the Bishop, previously to the reading of the Offertory Sentences, it may be observed, further, that neither of these documents lend any countenance to the notion which has recently found favour with some liturgical writers —viz., that by the "oblations" which we ask God to accept in the Prayer for the Church Militant, according to its last revision, is meant the elements of bread and wine, and not the money offerings or "devotions of the people," designed for other purposes than the relief of the poor.

In the Abbey Dore service, the priest is directed to read those of the sentences "that are *for the oblations*, and *not for the alms*: viz., the 2nd, the 6th, the 7th, the 8th, the 9th, and the 10th," etc: a direction which is conclusive evidence of the meaning assigned to the word by the framer of the Abbey Dore Rubrics, whoever he may have been. According to the proposals of Bishop Wren, the elements were not to be placed upon the Table until after the Prayer for the Church Militant had been read; and consequently the omission or the insertion of the word "oblations" would be perfectly immaterial, so far as concerns its reference to the bread and wine.

We shall look in vain for much *direct* light on the vexed question of the position of the priest during the Prayer of Consecration, from the proposals of Wren. We find, as Bishop Jacobson has remarked, and as we have already observed, a direction to stand at the north of the Table at the beginning of the service; and we find a recognition of the same position just before the Confession (p. 80), and also during the post Communion Service (p. 83); directions which it behoves those to account for, who would adduce Bishop Wren's suggestions as affording any *a priori* argument in favour of the theory that the Eastward position was enjoined or permitted by the revisers of 1661. With regard to the Prayer of humble access, the priest is directed to kneel "before the Table;" words which may or may not be designed to denote the west side thereof, but which we are of opinion most probably were designed to be so interpreted. With regard

Digitized by Google

to the more important Rubric,—that before the Prayer of Consecration,—in which there was nothing which corresponded to the words "before the Table" up to 1661, Bishop Wren proposed the words, which we shall now quote at length, in regard to which we may observe that if Mr. Morton Shaw had carefully examined Bishop Jacobson's interesting volume, he would probably have modified, if he had not altogether omitted his oft-repeated, but utterly groundless assertion, that the "undoubted framer" of the Rubric which was introduced in this place in 1661 was Bishop Cosin.

"Then the priest, standing before the Table, shall so order and set the bread and the wine that, while he is pronouncing the following collect, he may readily take the bread and break it, and also take the cup to pour into it (if he pour it not before), and then he shall say."

We have already observed that little *direct* light is thrown upon the views of Bishop Wren respecting the rightful position of the priest during the Prayer of Consecration, by this Rubric. In its indirect bearing, however, upon our present Ritual controversy, the phraseology of this Rubric is deserving of close and serious attention. We shall not now discuss the meaning of the words "before the Table," to which we shall have occasion hereafter to revert; but we observe,—first, that the words "standing before the Table," in Bishop Wren's Rubric, which,—as we have already observed, were in all probability designed by Bishop Wren to denote the west side of the Table,—are literally and grammatically applicable only to the position of the priest *whilst ordering the bread and the wine;* and that inasmuch as the only position directly and expressly enjoined upon him, whilst saying the Communion Office, is that at the north of the Table, it may be fairly argued (though we freely confess that the argument is not absolutely conclusive), that the meaning which Bishop Wren designed to express was,—that having first ordered and set the bread and wine whilst standing before the Table, the priest was to return to the "north of the Table," as at the first, from which—for the special purposes named in this Rubric,—he had for a time, but only for a time departed. And we observe, secondly, that not only is Bishop Wren's Rubric literally and grammatically susceptible of the interpretation thus assigned to it, but further, that had his intention been to assign the position "before the Table" to the priest during the Prayer of Consecration, he has adopted a very clumsy and needlessly ambiguous phraseology, which has rather concealed than expressed his meaning.

We will notice only one more of Bishop Wren's remarks, ere

Digitized by Google

we take our leave of a volume of more than ordinary interest, under existing circumstances; for the timely publication of which we desire to express our grateful acknowledgments to the learned and accomplished Editor. In regard to the words directed to be pronounced to the communicants at the time of administration, Bishop Wren not only abstains from recommending that the second of the two clauses (which was inserted in the Second Book of Edward VI. in the place of the first) should be omitted, but he makes the following observation with regard to the practice prescribed by the Church of Rome and observed, if we are correctly informed, by many of the Ritualistic members of the English Church at the present day, of interpolating an *Amen* after the rehearsal of the first clause.[f] Bishop Wren, whilst objecting to anything which might afford even the slightest colour for the dogma of transubstantiation, thought it desirable that the receiver should audibly express his assent to the whole of the prayer contained in the words addressed to him, and consequently proposed that at the end of the second clause the answer *Amen* should be inserted. His words are as follows: "The Church of Rome, to gain some colour to their fancy of transubstantiation, next after these words, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,' put in *Amen* there. Now though we approve not of that, yet there is no reason why it should be quite omitted."

It is no part of our design to vindicate the theological views or the Ritual practices of Bishop Wren, whatever they may have been. We think, however, that Bishop Jacobson has adduced conclusive evidence (1) that those views and practices were distinctly anti-Roman, and (2) that had Wren's recommendations been adopted at the final revision of our Prayer-book,

[f] Since the above sentence was written, the writer has referred to a Ritualistic production of considerable repute, entitled "The Priest's Prayer-book," and designed as "an Appendix to the Book of Common Prayer." In the Office therein provided for the Communion of the Sick "*with the reserved Sacrament*," the words appointed to be used by the priest in the administration of the elements consist only of the first clause of those contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and the response *Amen* is appointed to be said after them. We may add, by way of illustration of the teaching and the practices which are now being introduced into the English Church, the following Rubrical direction from the same source: "When the sick person is communicated with the reserved chalice, the priest elevates it saying." We desire to direct the attention of our readers to the three points involved in this direction, viz., (1) The apparently exceptional case of the administration of the Holy Communion in both kinds; (2) the reservation of the elements; and (3) the elevation of the chalice. If anything more is required to prove how complete in all its parts is the substitution of another Gospel in the place of that contained in the New Testament and set forth in the teaching of our own Church, we may refer to one more direction contained in the same form for the Communion of the Sick. It is as follows: "The priest then takes the blessed Sacrament out of the pyx, and holding it before the sick person says, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world."

Digitized by Google

the cause of Ritualism would not have been advanced by such adoption.

Amongst the numerous books and pamphlets on the ecclesiastical questions of the day with which the press abounds at the present time, the work of Mr. Beresford Hope is entitled to a place of more than ordinary distinction, not only by reason of its elaborate nature but also by reason of the general moderation of its tone, and the obvious intention of the writer to represent with impartiality the views both of his friends and of his opponents.

In regard to Ritualism Mr. Hope describes himself as occupying a perfectly independent or outside position. He affirms that the views which he holds, and which he desires to expound and to recommend in the volume before us, were formed whilst Ritualism, as the word is now understood, "was not yet devised." In regard to the perfect novelty of Ritualism, except in so far as it is a heterogeneous compound of mediæval practices arrayed, in some instances, in more gorgeous and attractive colours, we are altogether at one with Mr. Hope, nor do we dissent from the justice of his assertion, that the designation itself is fairly open to exception, as being applicable, according to strict phraseology, to the *science of rites* rather than to the *mode* in which those rites are carried into operation.

In support of his assertion concerning the marvellous change which has come over the phase of our ecclesiastical arrangements generally, in regard to buildings, to clergymen, and to services, and which our author appears to us to ascribe, in too large a measure, to the self-sacrifice of the re-invigorated high Church party, Mr. Hope appeals to the testimony of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, a Prelate in regard to whom he justly, but as we think somewhat irrelevantly, observes that he cannot be justly charged "with undue proclivities toward Ritualistic excess." The passage which Mr. Hope quotes from a speech delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1874, whilst inculcating the extreme caution which the clergy ought to observe in introducing changes into the services of the Church, bears ample testimony to the general advance which had been made in his own time, both as regards the fabrics and the services, but ascribes this advance to no one party in the English Church, either exclusively or pre-eminently.

As a lively illustration of the melancholy state of things to which the Archbishop referred as characterizing the early portion of the present century, Mr. Hope describes in the following passage, "The visible form in which the Church of England and its worship were first made palpable to his own childish senses, in the reign of George IV., at a chief town of Surrey, not thirty miles from London." It was the High Church Worship of the period.

Digitized by Google

"The building was a large, and had been a handsome, Gothic church, but of its interior the general parish saw very little, except the nave and aisles, for the chancel was cut off by a perfectly solid partition, covered with the usual sacred writings and some strange painting, among which Moses and Aaron shone in peculiar uncouthness. The eastern portion of the aisles was utilized for certain family pews or private boxes, raised aloft and approached by private doors and staircases; these belonged to the magnates of the neighbourhood, who were wont to bow their recognitions across the nave. There was also a decrepit western gallery for the band, and the ground floor was crammed with cranky pews of every shape. The pulpit, of the age of Charles I., stood against a pillar, with the reading desk and clerk's box underneath. I need hardly explain that the portion of the Communion Office preceding the sermon was, Sunday after Sunday, read from the desk, separated from the Litany on the one side, and from the sermon on the other, by such a rendering of Tate and Brady as the unruly gang of volunteers, with fiddles and wind instruments, in the gallery pleased to contribute. The clerk, a wizened old fellow in a brown Welsh wig, repeated the responses in a nasal twang, and with a substitution of 'w' for 'v' so consistent as not even to spare the Belief; while the local rendering of 'briefs, citations, and excommunications' included announcements by this worthy, after the Nicene Creed, of a meeting at the town inn of the 'executors' of a deceased duke. Two hopeful cubs of the clerk sprawled behind him in the desk, and the back-handers, occasionally intended to reduce them to order, were apt to resound against the impassive boards. During the sermon this zealous servant of the sanctuary would take up his broom and sweep out the middle alley, in order to save himself the fatigue of a week-day visit."

It is due to Mr. Hope to observe in this place that in his description of the depth of degradation into which the religious instincts of the people had generally sunk at this period of our history, he makes an honourable exception in the case of "the churches held by the evangelical party," of which, he adds, that at that time he knew nothing.

In attempting to trace the history of the "revived worship of the English Church" which has been effected within the last forty years, Mr. Hope ascribes a secondary place only to the Oxford "Tracts for the Times." He reviews, in a brief but interesting manner, the effect of Mr. Mozley's articles in *The British Critic*, and also of the building of Littlemore Church under Mr. (now Dr.) Newman, of the rebuilding of the parish church of Leeds under Dr. Hook, and of the formation of the Camden Society at Cambridge, in the year 1839. Our space will not enable us to follow Mr. Hope in his interesting sketch of the successive stages of ecclesiastical revival through which the English Church has passed in the present century, and in

Digitized by Google

which all parties within her communion have participated. We willingly concede to that portion of the English clergy and laity commonly designated as the High Church party, the chief place in this *ecclesiastical* revival. We think, however, that Mr. Hope's sketch would have been more just, as well as more complete, had he not only generally recognised the noble exception to the prevailing lethargy of the times presented by the so-called "Evangelical" party, but had he also directed the attention of his readers to the fact that it is to the zeal and devotion displayed by that party, long previously to the date to which he ascribes the ecclesiastical revival, that the English Church is so largely indebted for that spiritual revival, without which the increase of her churches and the improvements, both in her fabrics and in her services, would have been nothing more than as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

Having thus, in his first chapter, "navigated," to adopt his own language,—to which, however, it is possible that some of his readers may not be disposed unequivocally to subscribe,—"the smoothness of uncontroversial ceremonial," Mr. Hope ventures to launch his bark, in his second chapter, upon the more troubled waters of Ritual excess on the one hand, and of popular riot on the other. The tests by which, "in subordination to the plain letter of the Prayer-book," our author proposes to try the various incidents of ceremonial which he successively discusses, are the following:—(1) Compatibility with the spirit of the Reformed Church of England as a whole; (2) respect for primitive antiquity; (3) capability of proof without reference to the practices of the mediæval and later Church of Rome; and (4) legalization, by recent decisions, either of the highest Court, or of lower Courts from which there has been no appeal.

Now whatever opinion may be entertained in the abstract as to the expediency of regard being had to the second and third of these tests on the part of those who may be called to legislate upon the Ritual of a National Church, it is obvious that the admission of such tests as criterions by which individual clergymen or laymen are to determine the expediency or inexpediency of the adoption of certain rites and ceremonies, must give rise to an amount of divergency of practice absolutely incompatible with the order and permanence of an Established Church. The practical effect produced upon the mind of Mr. Hope by the admission of these tests is at once apparent, inasmuch as he proceeds to affirm that he has "no intention of insisting on even the most palpably legal ceremonial as obligatory upon clergymen or congregations who do not approve of it." (p. 37.)

Now we are by no means in favour of straining the interpretation of our existing Rubrics or Canons, with a view to reducing

Digitized by Google

all congregations to a rigid uniformity of ritual. At the same time, if we were once to admit that the approval or disapproval of individual clergymen, or of particular congregations, is to be the recognised test by which the ritual of each Church is to be regulated, it is obvious that the very floodgates of liberty, or rather of licence, would at once be opened, and that no National Church could long survive the adoption of such a standard of Nonconformity.

We are disposed to think that Mr. Hope's extreme dislike to the Public Worship Regulation Act has led him to express, in somewhat exaggerated terms, his desire for the permission of certain variations of ritual in accordance with the views of different clergymen and congregations, inasmuch as when he proceeds to specify more definitely the extent of the desired liberty, he refers to those incidents of ceremonial, as to the legality or illegality of which, either by reason of conflicting decisions, or by reason of the absence of any decision, a diversity of opinion and of practice may reasonably exist. In regard to these incidents of ceremonial, so long as they are restricted to cases which confessedly involve no doctrine, and in which long use has established a precedent which, to the minds of Englishmen, is almost equivalent to law, we entirely agree with Mr. Hope in deprecating all attempts on the part of the more numerous and more powerful party in the Church, to impose a needless yoke of bondage upon those from whom they differ. In one, and that a very important point, however, we are unable to adopt Mr. Hope's principle of action. Remembering as we do, the lesson which the history of all ages has taught us,—that the standard of toleration adopted by the dominant party is for the most part widely different from that adopted by the same party when subject to the adverse operation of the laws which they have themselves brought to bear upon their opponents, we should desire some more satisfactory solution of our present difficulties than an appeal to the stronger party, that, in return for the indulgence of any unauthorized rites on their own part, they should be willing to extend the same indulgence to others. Whilst yielding to none in our desire that the recognised rule of action amongst the various parties of the Church should be, "*In necessariis unitas; in non-necessariis libertas; in omnibus caritas*," we should desire that every proposed deviation from the actual or the received law of the English Church should be impartially weighed and determined upon its own merits, and not in the light of a counterpoise to other deviations of a similar nature, but in an opposite direction.

Before, however, we proceed to examine in the light of this test the various disputed points of ceremonial with which Mr.

Digitized by Google

Hope deals in the course of his elaborate volume, we will briefly allude to a few of those practical questions, which, however encumbered hitherto by the prejudices of opposing parties, are beginning to receive a more candid and impartial consideration on their own intrinsic merits.

In regard to the position of the font, the prayer and reading-desks, and the pulpit, there is happily little controversy in the present day. It is commonly acknowledged that the "ancient, usual place," near the entrance of the church, is the place best adapted, in every respect, for the font. The prayer-desk or desks are generally so arranged that the minister, whilst distinctly heard by the people, can yet feel that he is leading their devotions and praying *with* them, not addressing the prayers *to* them. The pulpit is generally so placed that neither the sight of the Lord's Table, where the bread is broken "before the people," is blocked out, nor is access to it impeded.

In regard to the appropriation of seats, we have little disposition to dissent from what has been well expressed by Mr. Hope. There are many persons who, as he has justly observed, "push a right principle beyond the bounds of practical expediency." "St. James," Mr. Hope adds, "denounced favouring a rich man, because he was rich, with the best place in church, and treating the poor man with contumely; but he does not say that the casual attendant, who may be not only poor, but arrogant, is to be at liberty, on account of his poverty, to push out the meek habitual worshipper, however wealthy he may be." Whilst freely admitting the advantages offered by open churches in large towns, he does not believe that "rural parishes, as a rule, would get on without a certain fixity of seats." He is disposed to be equally elastic in regard to the question of the division of the sexes. Whilst admitting that in crowded town churches such division may become almost a necessity, in order to avoid grave scandal, he is of opinion that in some country churches the attempt to break up the families would probably merely throw back church-going to the advantage of the conventicle, and perhaps even of the public-house.

So also with regard to the relative advantages and disadvantages of benches and chairs. Mr. Hope observes, that since the general introduction of chairs into our Cathedrals the prejudices which once existed against them have been removed. He objects, however, to the practice of lashing them together into "a makeshift form of bench," and observes, that benches "conveniently seat the large compact mass of worshippers." After an earnest and emphatic protest against Invocations of the Virgin Mary and the Saints,—against which, alas, there is but too much need for each faithful member of the English Church to protest in the

Digitized by Google

present day,—Mr. Hope eulogises in strong terms the "courage, prescience, and ability" of our English Reformers in providing a vernacular and popular form of worship for the people, and, at the same time, in vindicating for them the enjoyment of the ancient daily services; and, contrasting our own vernacular form of worship with the worship of the Roman Church, he observes, that "whatever may be the benefit of 'hearing mass,' it does not teach the Creeds, make the Bible familiar, or attune men's hearts to Divine psalmody." (p. 46.)

Proceeding to the discussion of questions involving greater diversity of opinion, Mr. Hope considers, at some length, the position adopted by modern Ritualists that in regard to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer *omission is not prohibition*, in direct opposition to the ruling of the Privy Council in the case of Westerton *v.* Liddell, that "no omission and no addition can be allowed." The gloss, as Mr. Hope very properly shows, now placed upon their own *dictum* by the Ritualists is, that "in order to show that any rite or ceremony in use in the Church of England before the Reformation is now unlawful, some direct prohibition of it since that period must be produced." We entirely agree with Mr. Hope, that it would not be easy to disprove the *dictum* of the Ritualists as an abstract proposition, or to show that that of the Privy Council must be received with very considerable modifications, although we do not concur with him as to the pertinency of several of the illustrations of the latter point which he adduces. Amongst these we meet with the following. Taking up the Morning Service we proceed, Mr. Hope thinks, without much difficulty as far as the *Venite*, when we meet with the following Rubric, "Then shall be said or sung this Psalm following," a Rubric which is followed by another equally vague, in regard to the mode of reciting the Psalms for the day. "Then shall follow the Psalms in order as they are appointed." "Now inasmuch as the Psalms," as Mr. Hope alleges, "cannot sing themselves," it is obvious that in order to secure any amount of uniformity in our public services, we need some specific directions how and by whom the Psalms are to be said or sung,—whether by the "minister" or "priest" alone, or by the "clerks," or by the "people," or by some one of the numerous permutations or combinations which are capable of being formed out of the given factors. If, Mr. Hope urges, in despair of avoiding some breach of the *dictum* of the Privy Council, in the way of addition, by the adoption of any one of the many alternatives which the Rubric seems to admit, the Psalms were dispensed with altogether, the persons responsible for conducting the Service would then render themselves equally amenable to the censure of the same high tribunal, as being

Digitized by Google

guilty of an illegal "omission." The same difficulties, Mr. Hope alleges, attend the construction of the Rubric respecting the Canticles, and also of the Rubrics respecting the reading of the Epistle and Gospel in the Communion Service.

There is, doubtless, a certain amount of force in Mr. Hope's objections, but not quite so much, in our judgment, as there appears to be to him: *e. g.* we apprehend that if any minister were to read the *Venite*, the Psalms, and the Canticles throughout, the people being of course free to follow him, if they should so desire, it would be very difficult to make him amenable to any tribunal for a breach of ecclesiastical law. The rehearsal of the Athanasian Creed may be cited as a case in point, and the rather because it is one of those cases in which a variety of practice actually exists in different churches. In some the minister reads each verse, as in the case of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the people following him throughout. In some, the minister and the people read the verses alternately, as in the daily Psalms; whilst in our Cathedrals, and, as we presume, in other churches where the service is choral throughout, the Creed is sung by the choir, in like manner as the Psalms and Canticles. We submit that in the adoption of any one of these three various modes of obeying the Rubric there is no "addition" or "omission" which would render the persons responsible amenable to any ecclesiastical court. In like manner, as regards the mode of reading the Epistle and Gospel. The recognition by the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth and by the 24th Canon of "Gospeller" and "Epistler" would suffice, if need should require,—which we do not imagine to be probable,—to justify the division of the service between two or amongst three ministers. Compliance with the long established custom that the Epistle should be read on the south side and the Gospel on the north side, would, we should imagine, exempt such an observance from the category of "additions" to the prescribed Ritual. The only case in which we can imagine it *possible* that a charge could be sustained, even under the most rigorous application of the Privy Council *dictum*, would be the case in which the same minister changed his position from the north to the south side, and again from the south side to the north, in contravention of the Injunctions of King Edward VI., by which "the shifting of the Book from one place to another" is expressly forbidden.

Mr. Hope's argument, derived from the omission of any direction for the performance of the manual actions of taking the bread and wine into the hands, and of breaking the bread, from 1552 to 1661, is, in our judgment, altogether inconclusive. That many of the divines to whom Mr. Hope refers did perform these manual acts, although not directed, we freely concede; as indeed

Digitized by Google

they did many other things in those times of prevailing disorder which were not in accordance with the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. We altogether demur, however, to the conclusion which Mr. Hope appears to draw from these facts; and whilst we freely admit that the performance of the manual acts, previously to 1662, involved a violation of the rule laid down by the Privy Council, we deny that such violation affords any proof whatever that there are "additions" to the Rubric which, though not expressed, "can hardly be held not to be permitted."

Whilst, however, we doubt the pertinency of some of the instances alleged by Mr. Hope, we do not dispute his general position, that no abstract proposition, such as that enunciated by the Privy Council, will admit of a rigorous and universal application; nor was it intended, as we believe, to be so understood or applied. On the other hand, the *dictum* of the Ritualists that "omission is not prohibition," when applied, as it is applied by them, for the justification of the revival of any pre-Reformation rite or ceremony which it may suit the caprice of individual clergymen to introduce, is, in our judgment, absolutely incompatible with that amount of uniformity of service which is indispensable in the case of a National Church, and diametrically opposed to those principles which determined the course of the successive revisers of the Book of Common Prayer, from the time of King Edward VI. down to 1661.

In support of this allegation it will suffice to appeal to the reasons expressly assigned, as we have already seen, by Bishop Wren,—one of those Divines whose name is constantly in the mouths of our nineteenth century Ritualists,—in regard to the omision of the warning against non-communicating attendance, —viz., *that the practice no longer existed, and consequently that the caution was no longer required.*

In his third chapter Mr. Hope takes occasion to refer to the Memorial, which has now been signed by upwards of 5,000 clergymen, including seven Bishops, eleven Deans, thirty-three Archdeacons and ex-Archdeacons, and a large number both of Canons-residentiary, and of honorary Canons, against legalizing Eucharistic vestments and the eastward position.

There has been so much misunderstanding and consequent misrepresentation respecting the nature and design of this Memorial, that we deem it a matter of sufficient importance to explain somewhat fully what we conceive to be its true meaning and its sufficient justification.

Advantage has been taken of the fact, that the Queen's letters of business have been issued to Convocation, with a view to the consideration of the recommendations of the Ritual Commissioners, to set on foot a movement amongst clergy and laity for

Digitized by Google

an authoritative sanction for the use of the eastward position, and a distinctive Eucharistic dress in the administration of the Lord's Supper. There is ground for the belief that many have been induced to sign a petition to these effects, under the idea that they have been resisting the proposal for any alteration of the existing Rubrics. Under these circumstances a counter-memorial was originated, deprecating any fresh legislation, the effect of which would be to legalize either the use of the eastward position, or of a distinctive Eucharistic dress in the administration of the Lord's Supper.

Mr. Hope impugns the course thus adopted on two grounds. First, he objects to the unfavourable interpretation assigned in the Memorial to the use of the two obnoxious ceremonies; and secondly, he alleges a want of candour against the memorialists, inasmuch as they do not, in so many words, pray that the obnoxious usages may be "put down," but only that they should "not be further legalized."

Mr. Scott Robertson, and those who have acted with him in this matter, might, we think, object with much more reason to the course adopted by the opponents in regard to these usages. For what are the actual facts of the case? It is notorious—for some of the leaders of the Ritualistic party have had the honesty to avow their motives—that, as regards a very large number of those who desire the legalization of the two usages, it is a question not of Ritual, but of Doctrine. They believe that the doctrine of the so-called Objective Presence, and of a Sacrificial Priesthood, are involved in these usages; and it is in consequence of this belief that they are prepared to make these usages the outward tests and badges *aut stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*. We by no means accuse Mr. Hope, or some others of those who have been induced to fight the battles of the Ritualists, of sharing in this belief. Our allegation is, that they cannot be ignorant of the position openly avowed by many of those whose cause they have espoused. Whatever, then, may be their own motives for the course which they have adopted in thus lending their aid to our common foes, they cannot reasonably complain that others should oppose the legalization of practices which are declared to symbolize doctrines, when those doctrines are believed by them to be diametrically opposed both to Scripture and to the formularies of the English Church.

We take further exception to the expression adopted by Mr. Hope, when he speaks of Mr. Scott Robertson as "throwing off the mask," when he characterises the Memorial as an "address against vestments and the eastward position."

Both of these usages have been declared illegal by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. In deprecating, therefore, any at-

Digitized by Google

tempt to legalize either of them, the Memorialists may be fairly described as signing an address "against vestments and the eastward position," inasmuch as they are content with the law as it is now expounded, and they deprecate any such change in it as would have the effect of making that lawful which is now declared to be unlawful. Mr. Hope, by adopting the phraseology "further legalized," implies that the usages in question are already legal. We, on the contrary, appeal to the last decisions of the Privy Council on both of the points at issue, and deprecate any attempt to legalize practices which are now distinctly declared to be illegal. What might, or might not be the course pursued by the Memorialists in the event of either or both of the obnoxious usages being declared legal, is a question perfectly distinct from that which is raised in the Memorial. Some might be content with the *status quo*, whatever that might be determined to be by competent authority; others might think it their duty to have recourse to all lawful means for obtaining an alteration in the law, if so expounded as to enforce or even to permit practices which they think objectionable, and to which they did not deem themselves in any measure committed when they took upon themselves the vows of their ordination. In either case we hold that they are perfectly justified in deprecating any change in a law which, *as it is at present interpreted*, forbids the innovations to which they object. The only course which we should deem unjustifiable in their case,—as we now regard it to be in the case of their opponents,—would be that of setting the law at defiance, and of continuing to enjoy the *status* and the revenues of a National Church whilst declaring themselves unable *in foro conscientiæ* to yield obedience to its requirements.

We have already exceeded our prescribed limits in regard to the length of the present paper; and we must reserve the fuller discussion of the history of the two practices which are now dividing the English Church in opinion, and which are threatening to rend her into open disruption, until our next number; in which, without attempting to determine points of a purely technical character, we hope to lay before our readers a sketch of the past and present aspects of a controversy on the results of which not only the efficiency, but the very existence of the English Church, as an Established Church, appears to us to be suspended.

Digitized by Google

DAYS NEAR ROME.

Days Near Rome. By Augustus J. C. Hare. With Illustrations. London: Dalby. 1875.

SOME three or four years ago we were indebted to Mr. Hare for two pleasant volumes, "Walks in Rome." We have now the companion series, "Days near Rome." It will not, we hope, be considered an undue disparagement of the former work if we avow our distinct preference for the latter. In the former it was not easy to say what had not been in substance said before, and, at any rate, the sights described were familiar not only to travellers, but also to most readers of cultivated taste and intelligence. What is now proffered is of a very different character. Mr. Hare has not wandered into—

> "Avia . . . . . loca nullius ante
> Trita solo,"—

but he has made his way to spots which few English visit, and which, indeed, it would be out of the power of the ordinary tourist to compass. He observes that "only about one traveller in five hundred of those who cross the Alps ever see Italy." In the truth of this we cordially agree, but if the delusion were not prevalent that those who in Italy, or for the matter of that in France or Germany, see a number of show places, have seen these countries, we could not blame the sightseers. Travelling after the fashion of Mr. Hare would be a long and laborious undertaking, even with all modern appliances, and life is short. To see Italy in Mr. Hare's sense of the word, folk must command not only money, but abundant leisure; for a season they must make it their home and their occupation. They must be endowed with vigorous health and competent learning of a somewhat multifarious kind. We do not, however, think that those who can afford to snatch a short holiday should be discouraged from visiting Italy, and gratifying themselves with the chief marvels of Rome and Florence, and other Italian cities. To them time is probably money, and the modern conveniences which make these places readily accessible are to be valued, because thereby intelligent people can procure for themselves refined enjoyment without being cumbered with petty anxieties and inconveniences to which, as strangers, they would otherwise be exposed. Even a Cook's tourist, if he has brains and eyes, may come home better and wiser than when he set out upon his journey. Many things will have become realities to him which before were indistinct imaginings, and the partial knowledge he has acquired will enable him to appreciate

Digitized by Google

much which would previously have been caviare to him. We think, therefore, a good deal may be said on behalf of those who make their brief summer excursions, venturing into distant lands, especially if they are careful not to bolt their sights, but digest what they visit. Still we hardworking folk envy those whose vocation is, like that of Mr. Hare, to see Italy as it ought to be seen.

There is yet another point on which we do not feel ourselves perfectly at one with Mr. Hare. To him the doings and changes of the Sardinian Government in Rome and its environs are eminently distasteful. He feels in the midst of them much as Monkbarns did when his sanctum sanctorum was invaded. "You'll be poisoned here with the volumes of dust they have raised," continued the antiquary, "but I assure you the dust was very ancient, peaceful quiet dust, about an hour ago, and would have remained so for a hundred years had not those gipsies disturbed it, as they do everything else in the world." We do not suppose that Mr. Hare takes any especial delight in the immondezza of Rome,—his idiosyncrasy must be peculiar if he does; but as distance lends enchantment to views, so also it may waft afar as fragrance what is in itself offensive. Mr. Hare writes from England, which is clean, about Rome which is dirty, and probably has forgotten what he may have suffered. It is not impossible that in the purification which has been found necessary, some venerable receptacles of filth may have had to disgorge their impure contents and to suffer the indignity of whitewash. Here and there what is picturesque may in consequence have lost its charm, at any rate for a season, and may in some cases have had to be removed, if a block in the way of essential improvement; but we shall be slow to believe that Italians would be forward to mar and disfigure what is now *their* capital. We do not ourselves believe that "the whole beauty of Rome" will disappear under the present state of things; but if the past could only be preserved by the continuance of the Papal regime it would be gain to civilization and humanity if they both disappeared together. Our hope is that the one will be taken and the other left, so far as may be consistent with health and decency. We do not want to see Rome Hausmanized as Paris has been, but even Paris could not have continued as it was in the presence of modern requirements. Much, however, may be pardoned to antiquarian and poetical enthusiasm; with this Mr. Hare overflows; he lives in the past, and, so far as we can judge, is a more trustworthy guide when reproducing it in his pages than he is in his speculations upon the present, where he seems to us to lack one essential qualification for right judgment, namely, impartiality.

Digitized by Google

Apart, however, from these fancies, which do not affect the sterling merit of his book, his volumes are full of interest. To those who may have the opportunity of visiting the scenes which he depicts they will be peculiarly valuable. There is a considerable amount of information about means of locomotion and lodging, such as is usually found in guide books, which is evidently careful and reliable. He has had, too, the good sense to embody in his work choice descriptions judiciously culled from books which few possess, or could not undertake to carry about with them. We have thus in small compass the pith of many volumes, together with a large number of quotations from the Latin poets, and of facts from mediæval history. If we were going to Rome we certainly would make Mr. Hare's volumes our companions.

In the introduction he furnishes some curious statements about the condition of the people. He speaks in most favourable terms of the amiability of their character, and rates the middle and upper classes much more highly than is usually the case. He quotes however passages which show that in many places Italian women are little more than beasts of burden: it cannot be well with a country where such is the case. He admits also the astonishing prevalence of superstition among them, and the terrible poverty which prevails, where, in the paradise of nature, starvation is too often met with, while Barons and Monasteries grow rich. According to Mr. Hare, "If an Italian peasant were told that there was no future state for domestic animals he would be very incredulous. When a number of the pigs of the Duke of Sermoneta died, his intendente, writing to announce the fact, stated 'Sono andati in paradiso.'"

The first excursion is in the direction of Ostia. Passing by the pyramid of Caius Cestius (the sole surviving witness of the martyrdom of St. Paul) he gives a lively description of the journey and place, and with telling effect introduces the story of Augustine and his mother, Monica, so familiar through Ary Scheffer's pictures. Five days after her conversation with her son she was on her death-bed. She wished to be buried at Ostia, and when asked whether she was not afraid to have her body so far from her own city, replied to her son, "Nothing is far to God; nor is it to be feared but at the end of the world He should not recognise whence to take me up." In the account of the Alban hills Mr. Hare mentions a remarkable instance of Italian superstition, which is, in this respect, identical with that of the Hindoos. In his description of the emissarium, constructed by the Romans to let off the waters of the Lake of Alba, at the siege of Veü, he says: "Italians always set fire to little paper boats, which they call 'fates,' and float them down

Digitized by Google

through the darkness, where they may be seen floating for a long distance." The counterpart of this may, as most persons are aware through Heber's beautiful poem, be witnessed on the Ganges. We pass over the visit to Frascati, Tusculum, Tivoli, etc., as places comparatively well known in themselves and in their surroundings. A noticeable instance of the ravages of malaria is to be found in the brief allusion to Galeza, once a mediæval town and an important stronghold of the Orsini. A short time ago it had ninety inhabitants, now it has none. "There is no one to live in the houses, no one to pray in the church." It is on the road to Bracciano, the huge castle of the Odescalchi, of which a quaint story is told. It was purchased by them from the Orsini, but through poverty they were compelled to pledge it to Prince Torlonia. He spent much time and money on it, never anticipating its redemption; but just as the appointed time was drawing to its conclusion the fortune of the Princess, mother of the Odescalchi, enabled them to recover it. It was the place which Sir Walter Scott was more anxious to see than anything in Italy. Full and pleasant accounts are given of the homes of Horace, and other Latin poets, in which much well-chosen information about them is communicated. Of another deserted town, Ninfa, the following is Mr. Hare's account:—

"It is an unspeakably quiet scene of sylvan beauty; and there is something unearthly about it, which possesses and absorbs every sense. If fairies exist anywhere, surely Ninfa is their capital,—Ninfa, where Flora holds her court; where the only inhabitants are the roses and lilies, and all the thousand flowers which grow so abundantly in the deserted streets; where honeysuckle and jessamine fling their garlands through the window of every house; and where the very altars of the churches are thrones of the flame-coloured valerian. Outside the walls (you would scarcely believe it) was a town: so encrusted in verdure is every building, that the houses look like green mounds rising out of the plain. It is as if nature had built the city for a perpetual feast of tabernacles. One tall tower stands near the entrance, and watches its reflection in the still waters of a pool, white with lilies and fringed with forget-me-not. By the roadside a crystal spring rises in great abundance in a little basin of ancient brickwork, and falls into the pool, where it turns a mill; and a little further on becomes a lake, on which Pliny mentions the floating islands in his time, which were called Saltuares, because they were said to move to the time of dancing feet. An inscription on the mill tells us it was built by one of the Gaetani, lord of the place in 1765. The town must have been inhabited then; yet none can tell now the story of its desertion. It belonged to the Gaetani since the thirteenth century; and Pope Alexander III. was consecrated here, Sept. 20th, 1159. From the town, say the natives of Norma, 'la bella Ninfa,' who was disobedient to her parents, flung herself into the pool to evade becoming the *sposina* of the

Digitized by Google

unsympathetic *patito* they had chosen for her; and ever since the name of the little city has kept her memory alive. Let it be so, though etymologists suggest the little river Nymphaeus as a god-father. The water nymphs will avenge all insults by the fever-bearing vapours of their lake. Ninfa can never be rebuilt. Even the shepherds cannot dare to pass the night there. Death garlanded with flowers is death still. Gregory I., who built a church there, in 1216, to 'St. Mary of the Myrtle-branch,' dedicated it in vain. No sound will ever be heard but the hum of the myriad insects which float amongst the flower-possessed streets and houses, the croaking of the green frogs in the surrounding waters, and the everlasting sighing and rustling of the wind in the tall bulrushes." (Vol. i. p. 235.)

In the account of Palestrina, the ancient Prænestè, there is a glimpse afforded us into the doings of the Mediæval Papacy, and the religion of the times, which is worth quoting:—

"When, in 1217, the Cardinals Giacommo and Pietro Colonna had opposed the election of a member of the rival family of the Gaetani of Anagni to the Papacy, they fled hither with their kinsfolk. The newly-elected Pope Boniface III. immediately issued bulls confiscating all the estates of the Colonnas, and promised plenary indulgences to all who would take up arms against them. Stronghold after stronghold was stormed; castle after castle fell; Palestrina alone held out with intrepidity and obstinacy. Almost the whole Colonna house sought their last refuge in the walls of the redoubtable fortress, which defied the siege and wearied out the assailing forces. Guido de Montefeltro, a famous Ghibelline chieftain, had led a life of blood and remorseless warfare, in which he was even more distinguished by craft than by valour. He had treated with contemptuous defiance all the Papal censures, which rebuked and would avenge his discomfiture of many Papal generals, and the depression of the Guelfs. In an excess of devotion, now grown old, he had taken the habit and the vows of St. Francis, divorced his wife, gave up his wealth, obtained remission of his sins, first from Cælestine, afterwards from Boniface, and was living in quiet in a convent at Ancona. He was summoned from his cell on his allegiance to the Pope, and with plenary absolution from his broken vows, commanded to inspect the walls, and give his counsel for the best means of reducing the stubborn citadel. The old soldier surveyed the impregnable defences, and then required still further absolution for any crime of which he had been guilty, uttered his memorable oracle, 'Promise largely: keep little of your promises.' Thus the Colonnas were reduced to open their gate, and proceed in mourning robes to meet the Pope at Rieti. He received them with outward forgiveness, and gave them absolution; but while they were detained as his guests, Ranieri, Bishop of Pisa, was sent to destroy Palestrina utterly, and ordered to spare nothing, except 'the Cathedral of St. Agapines.' Everything else was '*totali exterminio et ruinæ exposita.*' A plough was driven over the ruins, and the ground was sown with

Digitized by Google

salt. Even the famous marble of a hundred steps, up which people could ride on horseback into the palace, perished. The Colonna family fled in all directions, but Sciarra Colonna returned just at the time when Boniface was quarrelling with Phillippe-le-bel, and joining the French, captured the Pope at Anagni." (Vol. i., p. 272.)

Of the treatment of Boniface by the Colonnas there is a lengthened account from Milman's "Latin Christianity," but we pass it over. We wish we could find room for some reference to Subiaco, the desolate ravine which under Benedict became the cradle of monastic life in the West; but we must refer our readers to the book itself, of which it forms a most interesting chapter. Many similar descriptions we cannot even name, but we must mention one remarkable story, valuable for the moral it contains. St. Carlo Borromeo, whom Mr. Hare terms the great patron of idle almsgiving, went to Caprarola, the vast palace of the Farnese in the Ciminian hills, to see it when it was completed, and complained that so much money had not been given to the poor instead. "I have let them have it all, little by little, said Alessandro Farnese, but I have made them earn it by the sweat of their brows." Of Viterbo, "the Nuremberg of Italy," with its wonderful old houses, sculptured cornices, Gothic windows, and sparkling waters, we can only say that our curiosity to see it was wonderfully whetted by the account given. Of one of the palaces Mr. Hare says :—

"It is well worth visiting, on account of its connection with Olympia Pamphili, the famous 'Papessa,' sister-in-law of Innocent X. She was born at Viterbo in 1594, of the noble but ruined family of the Maidalchini, and was destined by her parents for a convent, but insisted upon marrying a Count Pamphili, nineteen years older than herself. The attraction to this alliance was the fact that her husband had a brother, over whom she obtained unbounded ascendancy, and who rose under her guidance to obtain a Cardinal's hat in 1629, and the Papal tiara in 1644. Her husband being then dead, Donna Olympia took up her residence at the Vatican, and employed the eleven years of her brother-in-law's life in the sale of benefices and appointments and offices of every description, for which she did not hesitate to drive the hardest bargains possible.

"Olympia established herself in the Vatican as its mistress. No step of domestic government or foreign policy decided on, was the Pontiff's own work. His invaluable sister-in-law did all. He was absolutely a puppet in her hands. The keys of St. Peter were strung to her girdle; and the only function in which she probably never interfered, was blessing the people. One day a large medal was conveyed into the Pope's hands, on the obverse side of which was represented Olympia, with the pontificial tiara on her head, and the keys in her hand; while the reverse showed Innocent in a coif, with a spindle and distaff in his hands. Another day a report was

Digitized by Google

brought to him from England, that a play had been represented before Cromwell, called 'The Marriage of the Pope,' in which Donna Olympia is represented rejecting his addresses on account of his extreme ugliness, till having in vain offered her one of the keys to induce her to consent, he attains his object at the cost of both of them. The Emperor, again, had said to the *Papal Nuncio*, 'Your Pope, my Lord, has an easy time of it, with Madame Olympia to put him to sleep.' (T. A Trollope.)

"Innocent X. died Jan. 7th, 1655, by which time Olympia had amassed, besides vast estates, and an immense amount of uncoined gold and precious stones, more than two millions of golden crowns. The succeeding Pope, Alexander VII., demanded from her an account of the State moneys which had passed through her hands, and restoration of the valuables she had taken away from the Vatican, but this was never carried out. The pestilence which appeared in Italy drew away the attention of every one. Olympia herself was among the first victims; and her son Camillo, who had been allowed to resign his Cardinal's hat, and released from his orders by Innocent, and married to the rich Princess Rosano, succeeded to all her treasures, and founded the great family of the Pamphili Doria." (Vol. ii., p. 86.)

It will serve to give our readers some idea of what country life in Italy may be, that when visiting the Etruscan city, Bieda, Mr. Hare and his party were almost constrained by the inhabitants to visit the Comte de San Georgio, the Seigneur of the place:—

"We found the young Count in his garden, decorated with beautiful vases and amphoræ, found in his own scavi, and with all the shrubs clipped into patterns, after the fashion of this neighbourhood. With the purchase of the estates of Bieda, the family of San Giorgio have acquired almost feudal rights in the place; but their tenure obliges them to reside here at least six months of every year, —six months of exile from all civilized life, for it was fifteen years, the Count said, since any stranger had visited Bieda. He had occupied the time in making a small museum of Etruscan curiosities found on the property." (Vol. ii., p. 99.)

At Montefiascone Mr. Hare saw:—

"An incised gravestone before the high altar, representing a Bishop with a goblet on either side of his head, is interesting as that of Bishop Johann Fugger, one of the famous family who burnt the proofs of the debts of Charles V., and lived in princely splendour in the old palace at Augsburg, now known as the 'Drei Mohren.' The Bishop loved good wine beyond everything, and travelled over all distant lands in search of it. He was so afraid of the price rising on his advent, that he sent on his valet before, bidding him taste the wine at the places he came to, and if he found it good, to send back the word 'Est.' The valet came to Montefiascone, and found the wine so absolutely enchanting that he wrote the sign

Digitized by Google

three times, 'Est, est, est.' The Bishop arrived, and drank so much that he died that night, desiring with his last breath that a barrel of wine might annually be upset upon his grave, so that his body might still sop in the delicious fluid, and bequeathing a large sum of money to Montefiascone on this condition. The Bishop's wishes were carried out annually till a few years ago, but the price of the cask of wine is now applied to charities. On the Bishop's grave is the epitaph placed by the valet:—

"Est, est, est,
Propter ninium est,
Joannes de Foucris
Dominus meus
Mortuus est." (Vol. ii., p. 109.)

Upon Orvieto and its glorious Cathedral, adorned with the paintings of Fra Angelico and Luca Signorelli, Mr. Hare, in common with all who have visited it, dilates with enthusiasm. Arpino, the birth-place of Cicero and Marius; Monte Cassino, the home of the Benedictines; Aquino, concerning which Mr. Hare makes no mention of Juvenal, although he alludes to Pescensius Niger, and dwells at length upon St. Thomas Aquinas, might all detain us, but we can only find space for the following notice of Astura, about eight miles from Antium. A tower and a little chapel are the only buildings in the vast solitude:—

"Nothing can be more picturesque or romantic than this utterly solitary wave-beaten castle; nothing more melancholy than its associations. Hither in Nov. B.C., 44, Marcus Cicero fled from his Tusculan villa, upon hearing that his name was upon the prescription list of the triumvirate, hoping to join Brutus in Macedonia. His brother, Quintus, accompanied him. They were carried in litters, and conversed as they went. On the way they remembered that they had not taken sufficient money with them, and Quintus, as being the least in danger, returned to Rome to fetch it, and was there taken and put to death, with his son. Marcus Cicero embarked at Astura in safety, but sea-sickness induced him to land for the night at Formiæ (Mola di Gaeta), where he had a villa, and he was murdered there while endeavouring to escape, within a mile of his own house. Augustus Cæsar is said to have been first attacked at Astura by the illness, a dysentery, of which he died (August, A.D., 14) at Nola. Strange to say it was also at the fatal Astura that his successor, Tiberius, was stricken with his last illness. Strangest of all, Caligula also received at Astura the fatal omen of his approaching end, when about to sail from thence to Atium." (Vol. ii., p. 270.)

The extracts we have furnished, and the remarks we have made, will serve to give some idea of the contents of these interesting volumes. They will not suit all readers. There

Digitized by Google

must be some sympathy with the scenes depicted, and with art and architecture, if they are to be thoroughly appreciated; and there ought also to be some relish for classical antiquity. Readers of this class will be gratified with the perusal of them, but through no fault of Mr. Hare, to some persons they would present little attraction. For ourselves, we must confess that we rise from the perusal of them with a singular longing that the enjoyment which the author experienced had fallen to our lot, "*non cuivis homini contingit*," and we must be content with the pleasure of following the narrative of scenes and places so full of interest and beauty.

"L' ANTICHRIST," PAR ERNEST RENAN.

REVIEW OF RENAN, in October No. of EDINBURGH REVIEW, 1874.

LETTER I.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Christian Observer and Advocate.*

DEAR SIR,—I quite agree with you that the extraordinary article in last October's *Edinburgh Review*, in laudation of Renan's lately published volume on "Antichrist," ought not to be let pass without notice in reprobation of it in some Christian Periodical; and, for this, what Periodical could be a more fitting medium than that which, in addition to its old appellative of the *Christian Observer*, bears now on its forefront also that of the *Christian Advocate*? I willingly, therefore, undertake the task you have assigned me.—But how can we fitly dissociate the principal from his admiring follower? We must have Renan's volume before us, as well as the Review of it in the *Edinburgh*. This will necessarily enlarge the task. And that in carrying it out I may not too much trench on the space in a single number of your Periodical, or too much try the patience of your readers by over-length of this article, I must ask you to allow me the range of two letters for my criticism, instead of a single one. There is the more reason for thus extending my notice on these publications, forasmuch as never was a right understanding of the predictions of "Antichrist,"—of their Scriptural meaning,—and of their fulfilment, of deeper and more pressing importance and interest than in the critical times now present.

As regards the Review in the *Edinburgh* well may the question force itself on the mind of every thoughtful reader of it, Can the writer really be a Christian? Infidel he most evidently is in spirit, as truly as the author of the work reviewed by him,

Digitized by Google

whatever his outward religious profession. He sneers with Renan at the character and the evidences of primitive Apostolic Christianity. "Chimeras, impossibilities, materialistic conceptions, paradoxes, enormities, . . . these," he says, "were the true primitive Christianity." (*Ed. Rev.*, p. 489.) He maligns Jesus Christ's Apostles, as if on the most important doctrinal questions at bitter feud among themselves (this I shall hope to notice in my second letter), and most especially the Apostle John. Against the fact of Jesus being really the Christ of Jewish Old Testament prophecy he hints sarcastically at the objection, as if really insuperable, of the "all but unanimous refusal of the Jewish race to accept Him as such, after whole centuries of Divine training and propædia;" and at Jesus Christ's, and also St. Paul's, attempts at accounting for this by reference to a prediction in Isaiah,[a] to the effect that only a remnant or selection of the Jewish people would accept Messiah on His coming, as if but a theory invented for the occasion. (Pp. 490-1.) As to Divine supernatural predictive prophecy in the Bible of things distinctly future, he utterly disbelieves it. And he deems Renan's so-called demonstration (after his German sceptical precursors) of the "purely historical" character of the Apocalypse, though "professedly prophetic, and laying a marked claim to inspiration," to be doubly important from its "affording a guage by which to measure inspiration; a sample by which to understand Scripture prophecy generally; and a key providentially furnished for a full and intelligent comprehension of what Holy Scripture is, and what it really means." (P. 511.)

Now to readers ill-informed, and too indifferent at the same time in regard of Scriptural and religious questions, however important, to trouble themselves with inquiring into the truth of what may calumniously be said respecting them, statements such as these, more especially when in a Periodical so influential as the *Edinburgh Review*, may be most injurious, by confirming them alike in their religious ignorance and religious indifference. In the case of those however who, together with true religious feeling, have any fair measure of good sense and a supreme love of truth, it will be easy to show such unsoundness of statement, and unsoundness of reasoning, on the part of both Renan and his Reviewer, on almost every point touched by them, as may well, when exposed, be a sufficient preservative to them against the pernicious influence of these writers' scepticism. To do this will

[a] Namely, Is. xxix. 10; as if this, though quoted by St. Paul in Rom. xi. 8, was the only, or the chief, Old Testament prophecy to this effect. There are few of your readers but would be ready to refer him to sundry other such prophecies, also elsewhere referred to by Christ or His Apostles; especially those in Is. vi. and Is. liii.

Digitized by Google

be my object in this and the intended second letter. In the present I shall pretty much confine myself to what they most proudly boast of: viz., the German Neologians' explanation of the Apocalypse, and the Antichrist there told of, especially as now set forth in new and brighter light by M. Renan.

To begin, the Reviewer represents this reproduction by M. Renan, in his more ornate French diction, of the German Sceptics' "Exposition of the Apocalypse of St. John," as "the sudden introduction into full daylight (sudden at least for English readers) of the true meaning of a Treatise which contains in itself nothing less than a vivid picturing by one of the foremost men of the time," viz., the Apostle John,[b] of the inmost thoughts, feelings, and mutual relationships of Christians during a period in the history of primitive Christianity (the period, namely, that follows after that contained in the Acts of the Apostles) which was previously "wrapped in profoundest obscurity." (P. 488.) For this German exposition of John's Apocalypse, adds the Reviewer, though followed subsequently in France by certain Biblical and other writers, "has in England hitherto found neither rivals nor imitators."

Now, even here, I may ask, is the fact what the Reviewer asserts it to be?

In 1845,—that is just thirty years ago,—an elaborate reproduction of Ewald's "Neronic Theory of the Apocalypse," with added arguments of his own, by the American Professor Moses Stuart, was published in two large volumes in London. Very shortly after, a briefer summary and advocacy of the same by Dr. Davidson, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Lancashire Independent College, was set forth in an article on the Revelation by St. John in Kitto's "Biblical Cyclopædia." Moreover, in 1851 these were followed by papers giving both a sufficient sketch, and I think I may say a sufficient refutation too of the theory, in the fourth edition of my "Horæ Apocalypticæ:" papers reprinted in the fifth edition, 1862.[c] Of which papers indeed I have found it convenient to avail myself in the present article.

But now as to Renan's reproduction of this Apocalyptic theory; —a theory, let it be always remembered, which regards the book

[b] Both Renan and his Edinburgh Reviewer admit St. John's authorship of the Apocalypia: the *latter* at p. 489 of the *Review*; the *former* at p. 371 of his "Antichrist;" though recognising the *possibility* of its having been only accepted by him as the true expression of his opinions. The Reviewer, through referring only, I suppose, to p. 41 of Renan's Introduction, has overlooked this.

[c] Namely, a general examination of the theory, in vol. iv., pp. 565—584; and on the *date* of the Apocalypse, vol. i., pp. 32—48, and pp. 533—548. ("Horæ Apocalypticæ," fifth edition.)

Digitized by Google

as wholly unprophetic, wholly uninspired; and representing only St. John's own views and feelings with regard to things present at the time of the supposed date of the book, and his conjectures as to coming events in the immediately impending future. Thus the *date of the book* is an absolutely essential preliminary to the exposition; indeed, so essential that, as the Edinburgh Reviewer truly says (p. 491), on the truth of these expositors' asserted Apocalyptic date "hinges almost wholly the truth of their Apocalyptic exposition."

And, as to this point, they consider the date to be fixed by three several independent, but remarkably concurrent, internal evidences to about the first fortnight of A.D. 69; this being the closing fortnight of the reign of Galba, Nero's successor in the Roman empire.

First, the time is marked, they say, by the Apocalyptic writer as one of savage persecution of the Christians by imperial Rome: this being evidenced both by the cry from under the figured Apocalyptic altar, in the fifth seal, of the souls of Christians martyred for their Christian testimony, "How long, O Lord, dost not Thou avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth" (the Roman earth)? and also the subsequent designations of Rome, and its ruling Emperor, in the visions of chapters xiii., xvii.,—the one as "drunk with the blood of the saints," the other as "making war on the saints."—Now just such a bloody persecution had there been of Christians by Nero in the years immediately previous to A.D. 69; a persecution commencing from after Nero's burning of Rome in 64.

Secondly, in Apoc. xi. 1, 2, John speaks of the Temple (the Temple evidently at Jerusalem) as still standing; (indeed, says Renan, as still destined to stand);[d] but yet as having the outer court, or outskirts, given to the Gentiles.—Very similar to which was the state of things in Judæa A.D. 68, 69;—the Judæo-Roman war having then already begun there, which in 70 ended, contrary to John's fond expectation, with the utter destruction of Jerusalem and its temple;—while in the two years preceding much of the country outside of Jerusalem had been overrun by the Roman armies.

Thirdly, and yet more specifically, St. John furnishes his own information most remarkably as to the *exact* time at which he was writing, in his explanation on Apoc. xvii. (though under the soubriquet of an angel interpreter) as to the head then reigning of the Beast figured in vision with seven heads and ten horns, and on which sate the woman that was presently after explained

[d] Renan, p. 401: "L'imagination d'un Juive aussi fervent que Jean ne pouvoit concevoir le temple detruit: . . . . Le temple donc sera conservé." A characteristic passage.

Digitized by Google

to signify the seven-hilled city, Rome. The statement stands thus:—"The seven heads are seven kings: five have fallen; one is; the other is yet to come; and, when he cometh, he must continue for a short space." After which St. John thus adds: "And the Beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." Now what can this answer to chronologically in the early Roman Imperial history, argues M. Renan, but just the close of Galba's nine months' reign;—a reign reaching from Nero's death, May 1st, A.D. 68, to Galba's, January 15th, A.D. 69. For then the first five reigning Cæsars had fallen; namely, Julius, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius; the sixth being Nero, who could not be said to have fallen by anyone that, like John, participated fully in the belief so common at that time, as Tacitus tells us, especially in the Asiatic provinces, that *Nero was not really dead* (on which strange rumour of the time, and the idea of John's belief in it, rests in fact the very essence of Ewald's, Renan's, and his Edinburgh Reviewer's Apocalyptic theory); but had taken refuge somewhere secretly among barbarian peoples in the East. After whom Galba, the seventh, was the one then reigning; but quite unlikely to continue much longer, considering both his old age and the fact of Otho and Vitellius being already in arms against him. Further, on *his* fall, whom might St. John most naturally expect to be his successor? Not Otho or Vitellius surely, who were but reactionaries in favour of Nero:[e] but Nero himself, that horrid monster of wickedness and cruelty, resuscitated, as it were, on returning from his secret hiding-place, and thereupon re-establishing himself as Roman Emperor;—the eighth, and yet one of the seven.

Such, says Renan, and also, though with one important difference, of which more presently, his Reviewer after him, are the threefold very various but marvellously concurrent internal evidences in the book itself, which fix the date of its composition by St. John "almost within a day" to the first fortnight of January, 69.[f]

And then, further, they add, the Apocalyptic date being thus demonstrably fixed, there follows immediately and necessarily the consequence that Nero, thus resuscitated as it were, was expected by St. John to be that last dreaded enemy of the Church, whom Christians had often talked of tremblingly with each other, ever since St. Paul's memorable prophecy of him

[e] Renan, p. 434

[f] So Renan, Introd. xxi., "Ou peut déterminer la date à quelques jours près:' viz., January, A.D. 69. Ib. xxviii. And *Edinburgh Review*, 488, "a date traceable with certainty to a year, a month, and almost a day;" viz., pp. 493,4, the close of 68 or beginning of 69.

Digitized by Google

as the *Man of Sin;* and, later on, as the Antichrist: seeing that the Beast under its eighth revived head was represented by John as the Church's *last*, as well as worst, enemy; just as was to be St. Paul's Man of Sin; and, like him, represented also as continuing until destroyed at Christ's second coming.—To make this the more clear as his own expectation, the Apostle added that the number of the name of the Beast under its eighth and last head, according to the then well-known system of *gematria*, would be 666; precisely which number was that of *Nero Cæsar*, in Hebrew letters, נרון קסר. Besides that the very appellative of BEAST would be recognised by Christians as what Nero, above all other men, had earned for himself by his public monstrosities of cruelty and obscenity.[g]

But, oh, the glory of the saints' triumph when this Antichrist's brief reign should be ended by the brightness of Jesus Christ's assured coming again; and thereupon the BEAST cast into the lake burning with fire and brimstone!

Such, I repeat, is the triumphantly alleged evidence of the date of the book, January, A.D. 69, alike by Renan, and by his admiring Reviewer.[h] Involved in the last point of which evidence we have also, they say, St. John's distinctly expressed opinion to the effect that Nero, resuscitated as it were, would be the Christians' last and most dreaded enemy, *Antichrist.*

But, if it be at all carefully looked into, it is my persuasion that both as regards the *Apocalyptic date*, and as regards John's asserted designation of *Nero resuscitated being the Antichrist*, the evidence will, *on every point*, be found utterly to break down.

Firstly, as to *Date.*

Now, as regards the asserted evidence of date from Rome's *persecution of Christians* spoken of in the Apocalptic book, it is to be observed that it speaks of those persecutions not as a thing only of the *past*, but as what were *even then in continuance.* This is implied in those words in the cry of the souls under the altar in the fifth seal (understood so by Renan, as referring to the time of John's writing the book): "*How long*, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Besides that John himself at that time, as he tells us, was suffering banishment in the barren isle of Patmos, with penal sentence, probably, to convict labour in the quarries there, for his Christian faith.[i] But can Renan, or his Reviewer, furnish

[g] Renan, p. 179; "Le nom de Neron est trouvé; ce sera *La Bête.* Neron sera *l' Antichrist.* L' Apocalypse est conçue." *Edinburgh Review*, p. 505.

[h] On the slight difference see preceding note.

[i] "In metalla damnatus." So the early Apocalyptic expositor Victorin.

Digitized by Google

trustworthy evidence that the Emperor Galba continued the persecution of Christians begun by Nero? Or even that Nero's own persecution of them extended beyond Rome, or Italy, into the provinces;—that it lasted, moreover, from the time of the burning of Rome, A.D. 64, to the end of his reign in 68;—and, yet again, that there was included the milder penalty of banishment, among its punishments, as well as the severer of a torturing death? I more than doubt their ability to answer consistently any one of these questions. It is Gibbon's well-known judgment that Nero's persecution of Christians did not extend beyond Rome;[j] which opinion seems to me pretty much acquiesced in by our late learned Church historian Dean Waddington, (chap. iv.), as well as others. And little certainly was it in accord with Nero's character, after that culmination of his cruelty in 64, to act on a scale of severer and less severe punishments against the objects of his wrath. Further, as regards Galba, he was never, I believe, charged with being a persecutor of Christians. The next Imperial persecutor after Nero is, by all early Christian writers that touch on the subject, declared to be *Domitian.*—Renan's evidence of date on this head clearly breaks down.

Secondly, as to the evidence of date from the outer court of the Temple being said in Apoc. xi. 2 to be given to the Gentiles,—as if meant by St. John in the sense that when he was writing the Book in Dec. 68, or Jan. 69, certain country districts in Palestine were occupied, or overrun, by Roman armies (for it was not till the spring of A.D. 70 that they even beleaguered Jerusalem),—can Renan, or his Reviewer, gravely stand, when questioned, to the opinion that the *one* was meant by John, "the foremost man of his time," for the *other;* even supposing that the Temple was there meant literally as that at Jerusalem; not figuratively of the Christian Church?[k] Or again, is it credible that in the same passage St. John should have intimated his persuasion that the Jerusalem Temple itself, or inner sanctuary, would not be given into the power of the Gentiles, as Renan (p. 401) asserts, familiar as he was with Jesus Christ's prophecy that it would be so utterly destroyed by the hostile armies that not one stone should be left upon another?—But in fact, turning to the opening vision in Apoc. i., John's explanation that by the seven lamps of the seven-branched candlestick, in the there figured sanctuary of the Temple, with Jesus Christ habited as High Priest walking among them, the seven Asiatic Christian

[j] "It is evident that the effect, as well as the cause, of Nero's persecutions were confined within the walls of Rome."—*Gibbon*, Chap. xvi.

[k] The Reviewer, p. 492, slurs over the difficulty. Renan, more honestly, in a note on p. 355, suggests that St. John used a little of poetic license in the statement!

Digitized by Google

Churches were symbolized, might well have seemed to thoughtful readers in St. John's time, even as in our own, to imply, not indistinctly, that what might follow of temple scenery in the subsequent Apocalyptic visions would also be meant in a figurative Christian sense; of which indeed there was direct confirmation in what was said of the souls under the altar, in the fifth seal, as the souls of Christian martyrs. So, in fact, and as a matter of course, Renan himself (pp. 361, 387) explains the two visions; though strangely unconscious, apparently, of his own inconsistency in the very different literal explanation of what was seen, and said, of the Temple scene in Apoc. xi.

Then, thirdly, regarding that which they rest on as the exactest evidence of all as to the Apocalyptic date,—viz., the statement respecting the Beast's then reigning head, or Emperor, in Apoc. xvii.,—it is most unfortunate that Renan and his Reviewer materially differ. Says Renan (pp. 407, 432), "The Imperial series begins from *Julius Cæsar;* so that Nero is the sixth, and Galba, '*qui regne pour le moment,*' is the seventh." Says the Reviewer, "Not so. The Imperial series must begin from *Augustus;* so that Nero is the fifth, Galba the sixth." "Such," to use the Reviewer's own words (p. 493), "is the singular certainty with which the riddle of this curious passage (Apoc. xvii. 10) can be deciphered!!" And both he and Renan have notes in support of their very opposite opinions.—Now, were this the only passage concerned, I think the Reviewer, on their generally concurrent *hypothesis* of date and interpretation, would have the best of it. For says John, "The sixth head is, or reigns;" that is, at the time of his Apocalyptic "manifesto": which time Renan, as well as the Reviewer, fixes as about Jan. 1—15, A.D. 69.[1] And certainly *Galba* was then reigning. But then there has also to be considered the name and number of the revived Beast, under its eighth head, *Nero Cæsar;* an appellative in Hebrew letters, numerally equivalent, we saw, to 666. Now how can this appellative be properly ascribed to Nero, if it is only as *Augustus*, and not as *Cæsar*, that he is the fifth of the Imperial series,—as our Reviewer would have him,—not the sixth?—Leaving the two disputants to settle the difference between themselves, let me remind the reader that it is most questionable whether each head of the Beast is meant to designate one individual Emperor. In Dan. vii. 6, the four heads of the third great Beast, or Macedonian Empire, seem plainly (as illustrated by Dan. viii. 22) to be meant of the four great *dynasties* into which at Alexander's death his empire was

[1] "C'est alors (Janvier 69) que fut repandu parmi les Chretiens d' Asie un *manifeste* symbolique se presentant comme une revelation de Jesus lui même." So Introd xli., "Le manifeste de l'an 69."—*Renan* 355.

Digitized by Google

divided; those namely, of Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, Seleucus. And, not without reason, I feel persuaded, was it the general opinion of our chief English Protestant Apocalyptic expositors, until quite of late years, that the seven heads of the Roman Beast, in the Apocalyptic vision before us, meant the seven successively instituted supreme executive ruling heads of the Roman Commonwealth,—kings, consuls, dictators, decemvirs, military tribunes, Augustal Monarchical Emperors; after whom, as the seventh, the tetrarchically divided imperial headship, though of an empire still considered one, devised by Diocletian was, I doubt not, intended (a point admirably illustrated by Gibbon); which head lasted but a short time comparatively, viz., from Diocletian to Constantine.[m] Following on which, after Constantine's removal of the Imperial seat to Constantinople, the next ruling dynasty over Rome was none other than that of the Roman Bishops, or *Popes*.

Altogether, even on their own showing, it will, I think, have sufficiently appeared how Renan's and his Reviewer's evidences for the *Galbaic date* break down of themselves, even were there no counter evidence.

But, first, there is the *counter internal* evidence arising from three or four notices in the Epistles to the seven Apocalyptic Churches. (1) In St. Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, written shortly before his death (A.D. 66), as it has been generally thought, Timothy is addressed as Bishop, or presiding minister at Ephesus, St. John the Apostle evidently not being then there. Is it likely that the change of chief Church-ruler to St. John had in the brief interval between that year and A.D. 68, 69 (Renan's supposed date of the Apocalypse) taken place? (2) In the brief though somewhat longer interval from the date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, written during his first Roman imprisonment, probably about A.D. 60, had the Ephesian Church lost its first love?—Further (3) considering that in the year A.D. 60 (as fixed by Tacitus) the city of Laodicea had been overthrown (*eversa*) by an earthquake, is it likely that, although restored, as he adds, by the determined exertions of its citizens, it should have risen to such opulence eight or nine years after, and the Christians resident within it have so participated therein, as that in A.D., 68, 69, the Church there should be thus addressed by Jesus Christ, "Because thou art rich and increased in goods," etc.[n]

[m] See on this, Part 4, chap. 4, sec. 1, of my "Horæ Apocalypticæ."

[n] Large ruins of the Laodicean theatre of the time referred to still remain. And very remarkably there still remains an inscription on one of its stones, from which it appears that the amphitheatre was completed and dedicated in Titus' seventh consulship, that is A.D. 79. Not till then probably can we well suppose the city to have recovered much of its former opulence. See my "Horæ Apocalypticæ," vol. 1, p. 547.

Digitized by Google

So much as regards counter *internal* evidence taken simply from the Epistles to the Churches in the three first chapters of the Apocalypse: and much more might be added from other parts of the book; as I may have to notice in my second letter.

And then what as to *external* evidence from testimony of Christian writers near to the time in question? Renan has none to adduce, but certain Apocryphal Sibylline verses, written, apparently, some (book iv.) near the end of the first century, others in the earlier half of the second century, which show that the writers' affected belief in the vulgar rumour that had previously gone abroad, as we saw, in the eastern provinces of the Empire, to the effect that the terrible persecutor Nero was not dead, and would re-appear, re-possess himself of the Empire, and renew in double intensity both his wickednesses and his persecutions. And so, too, other Apocryphal Books, as the Ascension of Isaiah, and the Book of Enoch. Not one known trustworthy testimony does he produce from any well-known and reliable early Christian writer.

On the other hand, we have that eminent man Irenæus' distinct and most trustworthy testimony, as your readers doubtless for the most part well know, to the effect that it was during *Domitian's* persecution, towards the end of his reign (about A.D. 96), that St. John was banished to Patmos and saw the Apocalyptic visions.[o] So, I say, Irenæus, the most learned Christian father of the second century; the disciple, too, in his younger years, as he touchingly tells us, of Polycarp, then Bishop of Smyrna, who was himself the disciple of St. John; and about whom they often loved to converse.[p] Now, as Irenæus wrote his great work on "Heresies" in advanced age, about A.D. 170, he must in those youthful years of his discipleship with Polycarp at Smyrna,—say from 120 to 130 A.D., —have held the conversations about St. John within some twenty years only of Domitian's persecution, and John's Apocalyptic visions. I cannot imagine a testimony weightier and more thoroughly dependable. Accordingly it was so universally received in the early Christian Church that no counter theory of Apocalyptic date appears to have been mooted by any known fathers of the Church for centuries after. It is implied, though very diversely, by Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen; and expressly affirmed by Victorinus, Bishop of Pettau, about A.D.

---

[o] Irenæus says "It (the Apocalypse) was seen no very long time ago; in fact, almost in our own age, *towards the end of the reign of Domitian.*"

[p] "I well remember the affair, when I was very young, in the lower Asia with Polycarp. I can tell the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and taught; and his going out and coming in; and how he related his conversations with the Apostle John, and others who had seen the Lord," etc. A beautiful passage, with which all Christians ought to be familiar.

Digitized by Google

300, in his Apocalyptic Commentary; then by Eusebius and Jerome; the two latter, I need hardly say, the most learned and critical writers of their respective ages.[q]

And let it be observed that this date is consistent in every respect on the points on which the Neronic date has been shown to be inconsistent; and moreover with the grand idea of the Apocalyptic visions being what the Apostle declared them to be: viz., graphic symbolizations, under Divine revelation, of the chief events that were destined to happen from after Domitian's reign in the professing Church, and Roman world as connected with the Church, even to Jesus Christ's second coming. What a contrast, even in idea, to the miserable, and every way false, Apocalyptic theory of Renan and his deluded admirer of the Edinburgh Review!

So much as to Renan's and his Reviewer's Galbaic Date of the Apocalypse.

II. And now, as to their theory to the effect that St. John believed, and in the Apocalypse distinctly set forth, that *Nero* restored, or resuscitated, would be the expected ANTICHRIST.

It seems to me not a little curious and noteworthy that Renan should have himself testified to the fact that among the Christians of that time the idea was prevalent that Jesus Christ's second coming would be preceded by the coming of a last and most terrible enemy of the Church, designated as *Antichrist*.[r]

For from whence could have come that appellative but from *St. John's own Epistles*, which Renan thus implies to have been then extant; and which, if not written by St. John, he yet admits to have been authorized by him as if his own.[s] More of this, however, in my next letter.—But, thus thinking, is it not strange that Renan should not most carefully have inquired into the intent of that remarkable appellative, invented (was it not inspired?) for the occasion, *Antichrist?* The same may be said of his Reviewer's want of inquiry on the matter. Had they done so, they would not have fallen into the absurdity of supposing that St. John believed that the monster *Nero* would prove to be *Antichrist*. I subjoin, as borrowed from the chapter in Vol. i. of my "Horæ Apocalypticæ," headed "St. John in Patmos," tables of all, or nearly all, the examples I could meet with of

[q] On critical or disputed points connected with these several testimonies I must beg to refer to my full discussions of them in the two essays on the Apocalyptic date, already referred to, in vol. i. of my "Horæ Apocalypticæ."

[r] "Deja l'idée s'etait repandue que la venue du vrai Christ serait precedée de la venue d'une sorte de *Christ infernal*, qui serait en tout la contraire de Jesus."

[s] Introd. p. xxv., In John's Gospel and first Epistle the Presbyter John, "tint la plume pour son maitre."

Digitized by Google

Greek words similarly compounded of *ἀντί* and a *functionary*.[t] And, as will be seen from it, the compound noun always signifies either a *vice-functionary*, taking the place, whether rightfully or usurpingly, of a functionary of that same particular kind, or else a *hostile functionary of the same kind*:—some of the compounds being used at different times in either the one or the other sense: *e.g.*, *ἀντιστρατηγος* either a vice-general, or general of the enemy's army; *ἀντιβασιλέυς* either a vice-king (viceroy, as we generally say), or hostile opposed king. But in every case the fundamental idea is implied in these compounds of a *functionary of the same kind* as its basis. Similarly *Ἀντίχριστος* may mean either a *false Christ*, such as those of whom our Lord prophesied (Matt. xxiv. 25), or a *Vice-Christ*, whether legitimately appointed, or self-appointed usurpingly; in which latter case such a usurper would, I think, most exactly answer to the compound word. Now, *Christ* being only the Greek word for *Messiah*, a man answering to the title must either profess to be the Messiah of Jewish Old Testament prophecy, or his Vicar; in either case recognising those prophecies as Divine; and, if in the *Vice-Christ* character, professing at least to recognise Jesus Christ as his Principal. What then of Renan's and his Reviewer's absurd idea of Nero's proving in St. John's opinion to be Antichrist, as being a *Christ of evil*, an *infernal*[u] *Christ*, a monster and mystery of iniquity, *Satan incarnate*:—Nero, who had no professed belief in, or knowledge of, the Jewish Old Testament Scriptures;—who would have scorned the idea of having anything to do with the superstitions of sects so despicable as Jews or Christians;—and, as to Jesus Christ, if he had ever heard about Him, regarded Him doubtless pretty much

---

[t] Compounds, I say, of *αντι* and a functionary; not *αντι* and a *participle*, such as some writers have given as if parallel, and bearing on this subject.

I.	II.
Ανταυδρος, a man's substitute.	*Ανταγωνιστης*, an opposing combatant.
Ανταδελφος, one in a brother's stead.	*Αντεραστης*, a rival lover.
Αντιβασιλευς, a vice-roy.	*Αντηρετης*, an opposing rower.
Αντιδιακονος, a servant's substitute.	*Αντιμαχητης*, an opposing fighter.
Αντιμισθωτος, a mercenary's substitute.	*Αντιπαλαιστης*, a counter wrestler.
Αντιπρεσβευτης, an envoy's substitute.	*Αντιστασιωτης*, an opposing factionary.
Αντιστρατηγος, a pro-prætor.	*Αντιστρατηγος*, an opposing general.
Αντιταμιας, a Roman vice-quæstor.	*Αντιστρατιωτης*, a soldier of the enemy.
Ανθυπατος, a pro-consul.	*Αντιφυλαξ*, a hostile sentinel.
Αντιθιος, one like, or in place of, a God.	*Αντιγραφευς*, a check-clerk, who keeps a counter reckoning.
Αντιφρουρος, a vice-sentinal.	*Αντιδιδασκαλος*, *Αντιχορηγος*, *Αντιφιλοσοφος*, a rival teacher, &c.

[u] Il n'y avait plus à douter. L' *Antichrist*, le *Christ du mal*, existait. L' *Antichrist* etait ce monstre à face humaine, composé de ferocité, de hypocrisie, d'impudicité, d'orgueil. . . . . Caligula a été l'Anti-Dieu. Neron sera l'*Anti-Christ*." (Renan p. 178, also p. 351.) "Le voila! Ce mystère d'iniquité! cet *antipodele Jesus*? Neron est ce *Satan incarné!*"

Digitized by Google

what, sad to say, M. Renan and his Reviewer seem to do, as an impostor.[v]

As to the Neronic argument from *gematria*, what authority can Renan or his Reviewer offer for St. John's being supposed, while writing a *Greek* book, to set out his name and number in *Hebrew;* a language unknown, doubtless, to nearly all around him? What, again, for there joining Nero's official title of imperial dignity, *Cæsar*, to his own name, in order thereby to get out of the joint words, Hebraistically, the mystic number 666? According to these writers John was not improbably familiar with some of the *earlier* Sibylline writers. And in some of them extant in Nero's time there may have been examples of the *gematria;* but always, I am persuaded, in *Greek* words; just as in the later Sibylline verses, Ἰησοῦς, Ῥώμη, and the initial letters of the names of several Roman Emperors. So also in Irenæus' conjectural words *Λατεῖνος*, *Τειτάν*, etc.[w]

And then as to Nero's personal identification by the designative of the BEAST, how could St. John have more entirely nullified it than by applying the designation to the figured monster under its previous supposed heads, Augustus, Tiberius, etc., just as much as under Nero? The *Beast* being plainly the symbol of the fourth great heathen empire, that is the Roman, precisely after the prototype in Daniel vii.[x]

Here, Mr. Editor, I conclude my present letter. In a second I shall hope to take up the shameful slanders of these writers against the Apostles, especially St. John; as well as against the primitive Christians generally that were contemporary with them.

Yours, dear sir, faithfully,

E. B. ELLIOTT.

---

[v] See what I have cited at the beginning of this letter of the Reviewer's sneer at Jesus of Nazareth's rejection by the Jews; and also what he says of Scripture prophecies.—As for Renan, he repeatedly speaks of the legend of Jesus Christ.

[w] In my third volume of the Horæ Apocalypticæ I have given a large number of examples of the *gematria*, in the chapter on the Beast's name and number.

[x] Not the third, as Renan and his Reviewer would have it; and by the real Daniel of Nebuchadnezzar's and Cyrus' time, not, as they would have it, after the German sceptical writers, the pseudo-Daniel of Maccabean times.

Is the Reviewer ignorant of Dr. Pusey's absolutely crushing exposé of the absurdities, ignorance, and mutual inconsistencies among themselves of these German sceptics, in his book on Daniel?

Digitized by Google

LATENT SCEPTICISM.

WHEN a minister of Christ surveys a congregation which he is called upon to address for his Master, there is sometimes a painful doubt how far they all accept with him the infallible truth of that Word of God which he takes as the sole foundation of all he has to declare. And the question arises how he may best deal with the unavowed scepticism which he may have reason to suspect lies hid, often almost unconsciously, in doubting hearts. Shall he meet it directly, or indirectly? Shall argument meet argument? Or shall he trust to the expulsive power of the simple truth of God? The difficulty of the subject thus propounded lies unfortunately not in the lack of matter, or in any doubtfulness about this common phase of hesitating belief, for about these there can be no question. But it lies in producing anything which we may feel assured will be practically useful. It does not follow that the method which is successful in one man's hands will be so in those of others. Nor is it the fact that the same argument, or the same mode of stating a truth, tells equally on every mind. Often, again, a peculiar manner, or deep earnestness, makes the less forcible reasoning felt, where an invincible logic alone would have utterly failed.

In attempting to deal with this subject we acknowledge that mere argument cannot reach the mark at which we are aiming. Our Saviour gave us the true distinction when he said, "Ye *will* not come unto Me that ye might have life." The unrenewed will of man is the real barrier to the reception of the truth; and the will is even proverbially said to be scarcely submissive to reason. Hence some contend that our arguments are out of place altogether, ineffectual towards any spiritual result; not, therefore, needed by the Lord, and just so much wasted labour. That, in one sense, the Lord needs them not, who does not grant? But it is only in the same sense in which He, all-sufficient in Himself, needs nothing of ours. For in another sense He does need us, for it has pleased Him to assign special duties not only to men but also to angels. And if, when one said "the Lord needs not our poor human learning," the retort was just,—"True: but He still less needs our ignorance;" it is equally fair to urge, "If the Lord needs not our arguments, He still less needs our silence and our incapacity."

In the question before us we are not directly concerned with the land of unbelief itself. Vigorous war is carried on there by the Victoria Institute, and the Christian Evidence Society, to say nothing of many independent combatants. And there can

Digitized by Google

be no doubt that such a bold front and conspicuous ability have told, and will tell powerfully in the end. For our encouragement in this warfare we may take the testimony of a competent witness as to the results of the conflict of the last thirty years in Germany, whose theologians have done so much to unsettle the belief of the world. Christlieb, a professor of theology at Bonn, declares that a truly Christian science has so vindicated the truth of Holy Scripture that in the pulpits of by far the greater number of the German churches, and in the theological faculties of most of the Universities, it has so completely driven unbelief out of the field that the latter has been compelled to retire, in a great measure, into the divinity schools of adjacent countries (Switzerland, France, Holland, Hungary). He further asserts that in Germany "unbelief has a greater tendency to make its abode among half-educated, rather than thoroughly educated communities."

Thus it appears there is ground for encouragement about the main battle itself. But our question does not concern that so much as a sort of border-land of unbelief,—a territory something like the world of the old Manichæan conception,—in which light and darkness have become mingled, and the object of the struggle is to recover the light from the darkness. Certainly the confusion is tolerably complete. Modified forms of unbelief occupy the pulpit. An eminent man proclaims in the University Church in Oxford, that the Mosaic chronology (whatever he might mean by that) had been universally abandoned. Others coolly declare that no man precisely believes the whole of the creeds; and if it is only a question of less or more, they are quite at liberty to make their *less* into a *least*.

Our people hear these things, and are often sorely perplexed. If they are literary or scientific, we need not enumerate the teachers who are waiting to enlighten them. But if not, many of them read, or at least skim, the periodicals of the day. Thus we need not send them to the organs of unbelief, for the *Edinburgh Review* will suffice to recommend Renan's "Life of St. Paul," and to hold up the book of Revelation as a very genuine and very interesting relic of forgotten Christian polemics. Prophecy, it tells us, is the last thing to be thought of there; it is a satirical, controversial, production, in which no less a personage than John the Boanerges, himself, is lashing the free Gentile notions of Paul of Tarsus.

If these things can be done in the high places of literature, the ordinary newspaper Editors throughout the country reproduce fragments of them for the less educated. Thus it comes to pass that there is everywhere diffused a partly latent mephitic vapour of doubt, which the less vigorous and true Christian life can

Digitized by Google

scarcely breathe and live. It betrays itself everywhere. Your next neighbour at a dinner-party is quite as likely to ask your opinion of Darwin's speculations, or of the real antiquity of man, as to discuss what measures the Government may introduce in connection with current political events.

It seems, therefore, that in this border-land of unbelief with which we have to deal, the skirmishes, so to speak, relate to the same issues as the more pitched battles in the great campaign against infidelity. Hence we may classify the doubts we may meet with under the same heads as the great systems of more or less philosophical unbelief. That is to say they will range themselves under these three heads,—metaphysics, criticism, and science.

I. As to the first of these, metaphysics, it is a well-known reproach upon our English clergy that they are, as a body (with however splendid exceptions), very little trained in dealing with its subtleties and difficulties. If this be so, we may rely upon it that the reason is to be found in our national character, and not in an accidental defect of education. The English mind is with difficulty induced to follow the steps of theoretical reasoning, or to attend with the necessary care and heed to the niceties of definition and the adjustment of abstract qualities, and therefore it neither demands nor would tolerate them in the clergy. At the same time, the greatest questions which the Christian teacher is called upon to handle, though really dependent on metaphysical abstractions, assume a practical form, bringing them perpetually within the ordinary English range. It is so both with the things of God and the things of man.

(1) It is so with the things of God. Here what we have to deal with may be briefly spoken of as the personality and revealed nature of God.

There must be something in the fallen nature of man peculiarly susceptible to the Pantheistic idea, for it seems to arise in different countries, at different times, without (in some cases at least) perceptible infection. And it must be so. The confusion between Nature and the Great Author of Nature is obviously easy, and obviously capable of many varied forms. No belief is so destructive of all tenable distinctions of right and wrong as this. And yet ideas about God, which ultimately run up into Pantheism, are rife in many quarters. If so, and if, as men aware of the currents of thought, we bear this in mind, how shall we deal with it? Obviously the distinct personality of God must be clearly set forth. We shall find Holy Scripture, particularly the Old Testament, dwelling on the personality of God with a vividness and emphasis we may scarcely have

Digitized by Google

realized, unless we have pondered on the conception of the Deity then current, and in idolatrous antagonism. May we not, therefore, suggest, that without treading on the province of dry metaphysics, and without committing the perilous fault of introducing infidel ideas, scarcely known as yet to the mass of the people, this great subject of Holy Scripture may be dealt with on the constructive side. It will be wiser to build up the minds of the people in the knowledge of the true Scriptural conception of the Divine nature, than to set up before them infidel hypotheses to be more or less successfully overthrown by our arguments. There is much matter for adoring wonder, reverent admiration, and awful love, in the contemplations thus raised. They are most honouring to God, and most elevating and beneficial to the human mind. And if with a rapid glance and a skilful touch the blank void of Atheism, the heartlessness of Pantheism, the chill atmosphere of Deism, be contrasted with the sublime majesty, the glowing light, the ineffable love of the God of revelation, waverers may be at least attracted, and simple belief will receive no shock. Without entering into details on this great subject, which might lead us into too wide a field, we may briefly suggest it as a duty to set forth God, as well as we may, in the grandeur of the Scripture idea,—His divine glory and perfections; the relation of those perfections to the Christian covenant of salvation; the satisfaction which this idea, and this alone, brings to the moral and spiritual cravings of the human heart; the historical fact of the actual elevation of the human race by this conception of God and His relation to man; the moral dignity and moral nature of the search after God; the perfection and beauty of the idea thus unfolded to us. These and the like topics may surely so be handled from time to time as to meet unavowedly, but none the less effectually, some fundamental fallacies of modern unbelief, while by God's blessing the conscience may thus be brought face to face with Him.

(2) A second topic belonging to this metaphysical notice may be named as Reason and its province. No educated Englishman can contemplate any portion of this subject without having the teaching of Bishop Butler ever present to his thoughts. Yet it might be wished that we were all more fully imbued with his calm wisdom, and not least in this matter of assigning the right place and estimation to human reason. It is a perilous thing, and, we may add, a suicidal thing, for a Protestant to vilify reason, and to convey the impression, as it may be feared some do, that we are afraid of its exercise. Once let it be suspected that we dare not bring our teaching to the test of the legitimate exercise of reason, and our hold over our

Digitized by Google

educated countrymen is practically gone. On the other hand, it is a shipwreck of faith itself to permit reason to exceed the appointed bounds of her office, or to attempt to make her understanding the limit of Christian belief. We would, therefore, earnestly deprecate on this head the denunciatory generalizing style which sometimes declaims against Reason and Rationalism with almost Papal fervour and unction. Irrationalism will certainly not beat back Rationalism. We must learn by the true exercise of reason itself to mark out the legitimate bounds of reason, and define the province of faith. When we are invaded on the one side by a fierce array from the Vatican, whose war-cry is the repudiation of reason, and of history, and the deification of the utterances of one poor mortal, we shall not fare very well in the contest unless, with the weapons of a true Rationalism, we contend for the victory of the true faith.

(3) The third topic to be briefly noticed under this head is the office of Conscience. We need not say how perpetually this is recognised in Holy Scripture, nor enter into details of its testimony as the great warrant for our belief in God as a Moral Ruler, and for our expectation of the judgment to come. Perhaps at no point do the bubble theories of development break down more palpably than when they attempt to trace the growth of the wondrous conscience of man to an instinct wrought by impressions of utility and convenience attaching to certain acts, through the experience of a million generations in the slow evolution of the *genus homo* from the *genus simia*. On this ground we stand firm indeed, and may feel sure of a response from every heart when urging the powers and functions and relations to God of this faculty within, which seems at once ourself and not ourself,—our very spirit, and yet almost something outside our spirit,—controlling and judging all. To enter into the discussion of details, scarcely consists with the more general scope of this paper; but we must note that here also there is peril on the other side. Conscience is great, and its office transcendent. But we must not forget that it is the property of a fallen being; that its illumination at best is defective, and that only in strict subjection to God's Word can it lead us aright. For here comes in one of the more subtle and therefore perilous forms of error which makes conscience the judge of the Word, instead of the Word the judge of the conscience. Thus in another form is revived the primary error of the early Quakers, as set forth in the "Apology" of that remarkable metaphysician, Robert Barclay, who first gave shape, coherence, and symmetrical system to what had been fanatical ravings. In his third proposition he lays down the principle that Holy Scripture is a "secondary rule, subordinate to the

Digitized by Google

Spirit." And in his second proposition he says that the "divine inward revelations" are not "to be subjected to the outward testimony of the Scriptures." I need not say how far the modern verifying faculty, claimed to be inherent in conscience, runs parallel with this; and how, therefore, careful adjustments are needful lest, when using conscience in all its peculiar force as a witness, or in some sense even a judge, we elevate it into the rank of a lawgiver.

II. If we are not to plunge into seas of learning and debate we must touch as lightly as we may on the second main division of the great controversy with unbelief,—The Criticism of Holy Scripture. When we think of the vast current of literature widening year by year relating to this subject, and how the student toils in vain, attempting in some measure to keep abreast of such a rapidly flowing stream, a writer might feel in despair when desirous to deal with such a subject within the compass of a few brief sentences. Yet after all, the simple rule is the wisest as well as safest. Technical criticism, whether historical or philological, has but little place in general ministrations, and ought in great measure to be left to experts. The office of the ordinary minister of Christ is to build up the people of God in the Word of God. And there is such marvellous organic unity, and such a hidden life in that Word, that week by week he may be so handling it as to confirm those to whom he is sent in the faith of its Divine verity. In a word, his duty will be to exclude unbelief by fulness of faith, and by sound constructive teaching out of the whole Scripture, rather than to attempt to batter down unbelief by very partial, incomplete, and probably crude, argumentative criticism. The criticism of the schools has a place and office, but it is not in the ordinary pulpit. And the well-read man will most effectually do his true work when he writes or speaks, having in his own mind an opposing error clearly defined and vividly realized, and yet permits no allusion to it,—no avowed or ostensible allusion,—to escape him. He knows the poison, and he quietly administers the antidote. How much more must a wise reticence be needful if the preacher be conscious that he is not very well-read,—if his knowledge be second or third-hand. He may then run the risk of a double error. He may misstate the very point in question, and he may introduce to simple minds a doubt of which they had never heard. At least, let his own faith in the Word of God be simple, unswerving, and transparent. There is something very infectious in such a faith, and it will go to a hundred hearts when perhaps a critical argument would scarcely touch one intellect.

III. Our third main division embraces what in our day, at least in England, presents the most dangerous front,—Unbelief

Digitized by Google

which relies upon Scientific objections. We may not be great as a nation in philosophy or criticism, but we have an eye and an ear for facts. If facts are against a thing we do not say, with the French Statesman, "So much the worse for the facts." We give it up. There is an unpleasant amount of suspicion, which has been industriously stimulated, that it is so with Holy Scripture. There was Colenso's "Arithmetic," and there is Darwin's "Evolution," and Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," and many more, all professing to be statements of facts or discussions of facts. And these things have penetrated deeply through large classes of our people, until a large part of our workingmen believe that facts of history, facts of science, facts of numbers, are absolutely incompatible with the Bible. But their case belongs rather to the main battle against unbelief than to our present subject.

How far in our more ordinary teaching we may meet the unavowed uneasiness and vague suspicion of incorrectness is not easy to answer. But if a methodical course of Bible-teaching is taken in hand, whether in lectures, Bible-classes, or other occasions, much may be done to reassure minds that may have been somewhat shaken. The extraordinary accuracy of the Bible, wherever we can really test it, is a subject of continual wonder and interest. And without injudicious meddling with science, which perhaps we may very partially understand, we may at least from time to time point out how one after another these scientific objections fall or change their ground,—how very few of them really stand on ascertained facts, but rather on theories founded on them, and by no means possessing the certainty of those facts. We may call upon geologists to agree upon the countervailing theory which they will maintain against Moses, and to state what interpretation of Moses they think it contradicts, which probably may not be the right interpretation after all. Above all, let us not denounce science or scientific men. Let them observe their facts and classify the results. We will listen to them respectfully and thankfully. They may even spin their theories,—some brother of theirs is sure speedily to demolish them. But let them not be so unscientific as to set up their *theory*, as distinguished from their *facts*, against Holy Scripture. This is the just ground of our complaint, and it is necessary to keep this distinction between fact and theory plainly before our people. It can be done without offence, without arrogance, without that manner which repels Englishmen so much,—that sort of tacit assumption, "I am in the pulpit, and no one can answer me here."

But we are contending throughout for the positive rather than the negative,—for confirming our people in a sound and

Digitized by Google

steadfast faith, rather than perplexing them in difficult and unwonted controversies. And surely we have much to set over against the claims of mere natural science. What has it done for the moral and spiritual, and therefore the higher life of man? The theories of God which it has suggested are either atheistic or absurd. Its theories of man, those at least we have in view, deny his spiritual part, destroy his moral personality and responsibility, and subject his moral freedom to a mechanical necessity. They proceed to deny to this being the privilege of addressing God; since, if there be a God, He must needs be bound by laws which He cannot modify, and which it is profane in us to dream of changing. Is this progress? Is it a belief worth living for? Do not these things give us noble opportunities, if we have but mind and heart to seize them, of contrasting the warm, living, loving world of the God of the Bible, with the cold, dead, mechanism of the scientific unbeliever? The one breathes hope, and heaves with brilliant anticipations, and is instinct with a power which aims at regenerating the world. The other is absolutely destructive of all that binds man to man now, and if left to itself must precipitate society into chaos.

As we attempt to feel our way thus hurriedly through the labyrinth of the many inquiries of man's restless heart, we have only been able to touch a point here or there, and then rapidly pass on.

As a last hint, it may be permitted to urge the necessity for a bright and hopeful spirit. The desponding warrior never fought a good fight. He may have scorned to flinch from his post, or to drop the point of his weapon, and he may have died where he stood. But the light of victory was never in the darkened gleam of his eye, and it will never irradiate his brow.

We may call upon our brethren, not only for the faithful love, which even in hopeless despondency essays to be true to the Master, but also for bright hope and eager faith. When the trumpet-call of Jehovah is heard the warrior must go forth to the battle, aye, though he knows not for whom he is fighting. Be he politician or soldier, philosopher or theologian, forth he must go. Then ancient thrones must fall, or a new empire arise to confront spiritual despotism. Then a prime minister is compelled to take the side he had scarcely chosen. Then the statesman of three and forty years unexpectedly hurls into the Roman camp the defiance which at last moves the sullen haughty silence that reigned there. Then the subtle Romish disputant tears the mask from the face of English disloyalty; and, for what purpose we can scarcely say, pitilessly holds up to our gaze the teaching and the practices which brought converts to his feet.

This and more must be, when the clarion-call is heard. When

Digitized by Google

He hath a need whom we serve, think we not that He can presently send "more than twelve legions of angels"? But who or what His angels may be, or what form they may take, we may never know. Only "He sitteth above the waterflood:" He is King for ever. All things serve Him. If our Master is so great and mighty, what matters it if we are feeble? He knows the work we can do. Are we to be despondent and faithless because our difficulties overwhelm us? The Lord calls us not to measure the sin and unbelief of a world, and to lift its intolerable burden. He knows all its weight: He has marshalled the battle, and discerns the moment of final victory. We ask not for repulsive pride, for vain self-confidence; we ask for joy in believing, we ask for humility that leans on Jesus. Then, the joy of the Lord being his strength, the words of Christ's servant shall have double power, for those who hear him shall know that what he recommends he has, and that he "knows whom he has believed."

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. I.

(1) *Introductory Remarks.*

It is proposed, in this and some following papers, to investigate the teaching of Scripture on the Divinely-appointed sacrificial system of the Jews, with the view of bringing out, as far as is possible in a short compass, its bearing on the atonement wrought by Christ, on the position of the Christian Church before God, and on the ministrations of the teachers and pastors of Christ's flock. Never was there a time when such a study has been so imperatively called for, as in the present day. On the one hand, the Biblical doctrine of atonement through the precious blood of Christ, is assailed as irrational and unjust; on the other, the rites and terms connected with the Aaronic system, by which God's way of mercy was prefigured, have gradually found their way into the usages and teaching of some branches and parties of the Christian Church, and are pressed with great vigour and pertinacity, as if they were essential elements in the dispensation in which we are living. It thus becomes needful to consider the whole groundwork of the system calmly and dispassionately.

A single quotation from one of the most esteemed writers on Ritual in the English Church (now, alas, cut off in the midst of his career, by a lamentable accident), will suffice to show the position assumed by what may be called "Modern Christian

Digitized by Google

Sacerdotalism." In a letter to the *Guardian* of Feb. 17th, 1875, the late Ven. Archdeacon Freeman wrote as follows:—

"In the New Testament Christ Himself is ordained of God as High Priest, and ordains His own priests,—'*As* my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you;' where there is no limitation to teaching powers, nay, priestly ones are expressly included: 'Whosoever sins,' etc. They, in turn, ordained and sent others. . . . . At ordination, when the laying-on of hands with prayer duly takes place, then, and only then, God takes of the priestly Spirit that is in Christ, and puts it upon the persons so designated. That is manifestly the view upon which the English Church proceeds in her Ordination Service. . . . There are two points in which an ordained priesthood is absolutely unapproachable by the lay priesthood: the power, viz., to consecrate the holy Eucharist, and to declare and pronounce with authority the remission of sins. . . . . The Jewish priest assisted, day by day, at the most stupendous miracle the world has known, save only the incarnation; a miracle of 1,500 years' duration, whereby a single nation and country was borne unharmed in worldly things, and blessed with all manner of happy communications in spiritual ones; all absolutely dependent, as events proved a thousand times over, on the due, however simple action of those priests. And again, at sin-offerings, a confession was undoubtedly made of some sin against the covenant, and pardon of it actually conveyed by the priest. And no less do the ordained priests of God's Church hold open still the door of heaven, by these two gifts peculiar to them,—due consecration and verbal message of pardon. To them alone, for wise purposes, has it been committed to touch with reverent and awful hand the line of communication between heaven and earth, and to draw from it the electric spark which consecrates the gifts of God's people."

With such a solemn, forcible, and conscientious utterance before us, who can doubt the necessity of considering, step by step, not in a controversial spirit, but as reverent enquirers, the teaching of God's Word on the sacrificial and sacerdotal system of the Jews, in its bearing on ourselves?

The subject is not an easy one, and at first sight not altogether attractive. Owing to the peculiar arrangement of the Mosaic institutions in the Pentateuch, we have to turn hither and thither for information. Our perplexity is increased by the fact that the English Authorized Version has not always preserved uniform renderings of Ritual terms, and has sometimes adopted renderings which give no idea of the meaning of the original words.[a]

Another difficulty must be touched upon. We gather from the New Testament that the whole Mosaic dispensation was a grand *parenthesis* in the history of the world,—a temporary ex-

[a] The writer has noted a great many instances of such diversities in his work on the "Old Testament Synonyma." (Longmans.)

Digitized by Google

pedient appointed by God in His wisdom, as a fitting preliminary to the redemptive work of Christ. Both in its legal and ceremonial aspects, it was fulfilled and so done away with by Him who is both "the End" of the Mosaic law and "the Substance" of the Aaronic Ritual. But as the fulfilment of the law of Christ has not done away with *all* law, so it may be argued that the fulfilment of the Levitical system by the Great High Priest has not abrogated all Sacerdotalism. There was law before the time of Moses, and there is law after the time of Christ. There was priesthood before the time of Aaron; why, then, should there not be priesthood after the time of Christ? Has He so swallowed up all the pre-existent and extra-Levitical aspects of Sacerdotalism,—has He so concentrated them in Himself,—that there is no *residuum* which finds its expression somewhere within the Christian Church? If it be answered that the *residuum* is to be found in the universal priesthood of believers, then the ready reply is forthcoming,—As the Jews were a nation of priests, and yet had their specific priesthood, the Aaronic, as well, so the Christian community may be a kingdom of priests, and yet may have their specific priesthood, the ministry, also. The same answer is often given with regard to sacrifices.

How are such questions as these to be decided? Evidently they must be examined and determined in the light of Scripture. We say Scripture, the written Word of God, because that is accepted in our own Church as the final court of appeal. The testimony of the Fathers is interesting; but not only is it loose and vague on all critical questions connected with the Old Testament, but also it is peculiarly tinged with sacerdotal language, and in that respect presents a marked contrast with the writings of the New Testament. This contrast is readily to be accounted for when we remember that many of the earliest Fathers, being Gentiles, had drawn in their first religious impressions not from the inspired language of the Apostles, but from the sacerdotal language common to all heathen nations. Temples, sacrifices, and priests, were abundant among them; synagogues, elders, and Christian rites, were not familiar to their minds. Whilst valuing, therefore, the testimony of the Fathers as to matters of fact, we feel constrained to construe their language on Ritual questions by the light afforded in the New Testament.

The plan which it is proposed to pursue in the following papers is to sketch out the sacrificial system of the Jews, giving such details as may give a clear idea of what actually took place in the various rites; then in one or two concluding papers, to show from the New Testament how these rites bear on the work of Christ and on the functions of the Christian ministry.

And first we must consider the office of the priesthood.

Digitized by Google

(2) *The Priesthood.*

The first priest mentioned in the Bible was Melchizedec. He is introduced upon the scene very abruptly, and it is apparently taken for granted that readers of Genesis needed no explanation of his peculiar title. It was a familiar word,—a household word, probably in those days. By his name and offices this remarkable person foreshadowed One who was to be the King of Righteousness, the Prince of Peace, and who was to rule as a Priest upon His throne for ever. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in commenting upon the brief mention of him in Genesis, gives no account of the sacerdotal duties which he performed. In fact, both the origin of the word *Cohen* (priest) is doubtful, and the exact nature of the functions which it represented, is lost in obscurity. As for the term, the great Hebrew lexicographer, Fuerst, connects it with the root *Con*, and with the Arabic *Khan*, a ruler or administrator. As for the office, it may suffice at present to observe generally, that God has frequently employed human instruments to convey instruction and blessing to mankind, and to be the medium through whom the families of earth should realize their relationship with Him, and their office may have received this special designation even before the patriarchal age. Just as the sons of David who are called priests (in the original) in 2 Sam. viii. 18, are described as "at the King's hand" in the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xviii. 17, so some who were in a special sense the sons of God, may have been called His priests in the very earliest times, because they were at His hand as His own familiar friends, and were appointed to act for Him, or represent Him to some extent amongst men. It is for this reason, no doubt, that the name is applied not only to Aaron, but also to Moses, in Ps. xcix. 6. He was brought near to the Divine Being: God spoke to him face to face, as a man speaks to his brother. Similarly the chosen people of God were designated as a "kingdom of priests," or a "royal priesthood," both in the Old and New Testaments, because they were brought into a special and close relationship with the Most High, and were to shine forth as His ministers amidst a world lying in darkness. Nor is it to be forgotten that one of the most sublime promises yet to be fulfilled in the saints is this, that "they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." (Rev. xx. 6.)

It is sometimes affirmed that the firstborn of every family occupied a priestly as well as a kingly position during the antediluvian and the patriarchal dispensations. In that case, "the priests which come near to the Lord," mentioned in Ex. xix. 22, 24, must have been the heads of families. This is a very

Digitized by Google

natural supposition, but no clear proof of it can be given, the earliest authority for its assertion being Rabbinical. The young men of the children of Israel mentioned in Ex. xxiv. 5, who offered burnt-offerings and sacrificial peace-offerings, were doubtless selected representatives; but the mode of their selection cannot now be ascertained. One thing is plain from Heb. v. 4,—no one was to assume the priestly office without either a personal call from God, or some sort of hereditary claim which might be considered as equal to a Divine call.

Even after the priestly office was concentrated in the house of Aaron, the members of other tribes were occasionally permitted to perform sacerdotal acts. Thus Manoah, who was of the tribe of Dan, offered a burnt-offering on a rock (Judges xiii. 16—25); and Gideon, who was of the tribe of Manasseh, built an altar and offered a burnt-offering. (Judges vi. 26.) In these and other cases there seems to have been either a plain revelation, or else a clear reason, sanctioned by God, for breaking through the ordinary and established rule. In some passages where Kings or others are represented as offering sacrifices, we are to understand simply that they caused the appointed priests to perform the necessary rites.

The priestly office was analogous in some respects with the prophetic. Both priest and prophet were angels, or messengers of the Lord of Hosts. It was their duty to treasure up knowledge (*i.e.*, to keep it *for* the people, not *from* them), and to seek the law at God's mouth. (Mal. ii. 7.) Men who wished to inquire of the Lord came either to the priest or to the prophet, each of whom seems to have been empowered from time to time not only to give general instruction out of God's Word, but also to give special and inspired advice on practical matters. The last recorded instance of such prophetic counsel proceeding from the mouth of a priest, is the recommendation of Caiaphas that one man should die for the people, so that the whole nation might not perish,—words which had a far deeper significance than he himself supposed. (John xi. 49—52.) It is sometimes supposed that the declaration of the forgiveness of sins was an essentially sacerdotal act, but it appears to have been rather prophetical (2 Sam. xii. 13), though the work of atonement, the basis of all pardon, was strictly dependent on the ministrations of the priest. (Lev. iv. 20.)

Confining our attention now to the priestly duties of Aaron and his sons, as laid down in the Law of Moses, we learn that their peculiar function was to bring the offerings of the people near to God, through the performance of certain rites which were minutely specified. Just as in the present dispensation, no sacrifices are well pleasing to God except through Jesus Christ,

Digitized by Google

so no offering was accepted by Him under the Jewish dispensation, except through the medium of sacerdotal ministrations. Even the wood was to be arranged on the altar, and the fire to be kept alight and kindled afresh by priestly hands. The blood of all victims, though shed in most cases by the lay offerer, must be poured forth upon the altar by God's appointed minister. The bodies of the animals which were wholly burnt,—the fat, kidneys, and caul of all other victims,—the handful or "memorial" of the Minchah or wheaten offering,—all these must be caused to ascend to heaven by the action of the priest.

The burning of incense in the Holy Place before the Lord, was another very special duty most strictly confined to the house of Aaron. The history contained in the sixteenth of Numbers may be referred to as illustrative of this point. An attempt had been made by certain Reubenites and Levites to interfere with the appointed order of things, the one party probably on political or civil grounds, the other on a mistaken view of the principle of religious equality. The matter assumed serious proportions, for no less than two hundred and fifty Princes of the congregation, men of renown, were implicated. These men stood at the entrance of the tabernacle of Meeting, censer in hand, with burning coals and kindled incense, performing, or attempting to perform, the specific functions of the priesthood. Their destruction by fire from the Lord, and the sudden entombment of their company, with all that belonged to them, were signal proofs of the Lord's anger with them for their presumption. When the plague followed as a further visitation upon a murmuring people, we read that Aaron, the very person whose privileges had been invaded, took a censer (or rather *the* censer), and put fire thereon from the altar, and put incense on it whilst standing between the living and the dead. Atonement was thus made, and the plague was stayed. The material in the censer of Aaron may have been compounded in exactly the same way as that used by the two hundred and fifty. The difference was that the one was the appointed medium of approach to God, and the other was not.

The budding of the almond rod, through the operation of Him who brings life from the dead, was a further confirmatory proof that Aaron was in a special sense God's priest. Immediately after this occurrence, detailed directions were given as to the respective duties of the priests and Levites. The Lord said to Aaron, "Thou and thy sons and thy father's house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the sanctuary: and thou and thy sons with thee shall bear the iniquity of your priesthood. And thy brethren also of the tribe of Levi, the tribe of thy father, bring thou with thee, that they may be joined unto thee, and

Digitized by Google

minister unto thee: but thou and thy sons with thee (shall minister) before the tabernacle of witness. And they shall keep thy charge, and the charge of all the tabernacle: only they shall not come nigh the vessels of the sanctuary and the altar, that neither they, nor ye also, die. And they shall be joined unto thee, and keep the charge of the tabernacle of meeting, for all the service of the tabernacle: and a stranger shall not come nigh unto thee. And ye shall keep the charge of the sanctuary, and the charge of the altar: that there be no wrath any more upon the children of Israel." (Num. xviii. 1—5.) Thus the Levites were to minister to Aaron and his sons, and Aaron and his sons were to bear all the responsibility connected with the sanctuary and the priesthood. The ministration at the altar itself, and within the sanctuary, where the sacred lamp-stand, the table of shewbread, and the altar of incense were placed, was restricted to Aaron's family, and was to descend in a direct line from father to son. The other families in the tribe of Levi had their respective duties, which were purely human, though sacred, in the court of the sanctuary. It appears from Num. viii. 17, 18, that the Levites were accepted by God as a substitute for the firstborn of all the tribes, who otherwise would have to be devoted to His service, and were set apart for their office by the laying on of the people's hands. (Ver. 10.) An interesting reference to the respective duties of priests and Levites, as performed in the days of King David, will be found in 1 Chron. xxiii. 13—32, only it is to be observed that the beginning of the thirty-first verse is wrongly translated in the Authorized Version. Instead of "and to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord," we ought to read, "and for all the burnt-offerings, even the burnt-offerings of the Lord." As the passage stands in our version it would imply that the Levites had the duty of offering the burnt-sacrifices, whereas they had only to perform certain inferior ministrations with respect to them.

The question is often raised whether the priest was God's representative or man's, or whether it may fairly be said that he represented both. We gather from the beginning of the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that a priest was selected from amongst men by God, who ordained (that is to say, appointed) him to minister on man's behalf in things pertaining to God. He had to present man's gifts and man's sin-offerings to the Most High. Thus he acted in man's interests; but yet the special work which he performed was a Divine work, not a human. His peculiar office was to make atonement for sin through the presentation of the victim's blood on the altar, and through the burning or vaporising both of the blood and also of the whole or part of the flesh. Thus his work was intended to

Digitized by Google

prefigure the work of God, who in Christ reconciled the world unto Himself. On the whole, it seems most in accordance with the scheme contained in the Pentateuch, to say that the elders of the congregation were the legitimate representatives of the people; but that the priest was the representative of God Himself, setting forth by outward and visible signs those plans of mercy which the Incarnate Son was afterwards to carry out in His own Person.

Thus we have a three-fold representation. The priest represented God; the Levites represented the firstborn of Israel; and the presbytery or elders of the tribes represented the people as a whole. The Israelites had nothing to do with the selection of the priest,—that was entirely God's work; but they had to lay their hands on the Levites, so as to signify that the sacred service performed by that tribe was to be a substitute for the dedication of their own firstborn to God; and this laying on of hands was doubtless performed not by every individual Israelite, but by "the elders of the congregation," as in the case of the sin-offering. (Lev. iv. 13, 15.)

Since the priest was nothing less than the agent or representative of God, setting forth His atoning work amongst men, it is natural to find that everything about him was invested with a peculiar sanctity. Physically as well as morally, the holder of the sacerdotal office was to be as far as possible unblemished. He was to hold aloof from some of the ordinary ways and customs of society. He was to follow special rules as to marriage, mourning for the dead, etc. At his consecration he was to undergo ceremonial cleansing, then to be anointed with oil; his services were to be rendered acceptable by means of a sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and a peace-offering; his hands were to be filled with the sacrificial flesh, to indicate the weight of responsibility and the solemnity of the office conferred upon him; his hand, foot, and ear were to be touched with blood and oil, to symbolize the dedication of his heart and active powers to the Lord. Moreover, these peculiar rites were to be repeated on seven consecutive days, to signify the completeness and perfection of the work of consecration necessitated for this special office. It should be added that in Aaron's case, fire came down from heaven to seal the Divine appointment. (Lev. ix. 24.)

Exact directions were given by God for the priest's dress. Over his inner garments, which were probably white, he wore a blue robe and an embroidered ephod, with golden bells and pomegranates. Whilst performing his ministrations, he stood all glittering with symbolic ornaments. The plate of gold on his mitre was inscribed with the words, "Holiness to the Lord"; the shoulder-pieces and breast-plate, emblazoned with the names

Digitized by Google

of the twelve tribes, signified that he was acting in behalf of all the tribes; whilst the mysterious *urim* and *thummim* indicated that he was the representative of One who was all light and perfection.

Strict directions were also given with respect to the food of the priestly family. It was to consist in the main of certain offerings and parts of offerings, which are specified in Lev. vi., vii.; Num. xviii.; and Deut xviii. 3, 4. The Lord was their inheritance, and it was their religious duty as well as privilege to eat the food that belonged to Him. The priests consumed certain offerings as God's representatives, and their eating of these was regarded as an atoning act. (See Lev. x. 17.) It will be remembered that the sons of Levi sinned through their covetousness or greediness about the offerings. Not contented with the gifts which were appointed, they demanded certain special portions of the meat, and that before it was cooked. (1 Sam. ii. 12—17.) This course was regarded by the Lord as a very grievous sin. Amongst the offerings specially set apart as food for the priests, was the shewbread. When the priest gave some of it to David and his men at Nob, he broke the letter of the law; but the circumstances were exceptional, and the Lord did not condemn him. (1 Sam. xxi. 4; compare Mark ii. 25, 26.) Nothing, however, but a matter of life and death could have warranted such a departure from the Divine order.

Having now briefly considered the nature, importance, and sacredness of the priestly office, in the next place attention must be drawn to the scene of the sacerdotal ministrations.

(3) *The Tabernacle.*

It is unnecssary, for the present purpose, to enter into minute details as to the structure of the Tabernacle. A general outline, however, may be given. The court, or sacred enclosure, was 150 feet by 75, and was shut in by a screen of linen 7½ feet high, supported on 60 pillars or upright posts. On entering at the gateway, which was at the eastern end, the worshipper saw immediately before him the laver for the ceremonial washing of the priests, and also the great brazen altar, from which the vapour of the various offerings was continually arising. Beyond the altar, stood the sanctuary itself. This gorgeous structure was divided into two compartments,—the holy place, which was 30 feet long by 15 wide; and the most holy, which was a perfect cube, 15 feet every way. The cubical form was no doubt intended to serve for the spherical, and thus to indicate the infinity of God's dwelling-place. The whole structure could readily be set up and taken down, the framework on three sides being com-

Digitized by Google

posed of gilded posts fixed in silver sockets, and kept steady by transverse bars. The eastern end, by which it was entered, was protected simply by a veil or curtain. Everything about the Tabernacle was made according to a pattern exhibited to Moses in vision. (Ex. xxvi. 30.) The same was also the case with the Temple of Solomon. (2 Chron. iii. 3.)

The materials used in the construction of the sanctuary, and of the sacred vestments, ornaments, and vessels, were exceedingly precious. They included gems, gold, silver, brass or bronze, shittim or acacia wood, linen, cotton, skins, etc. The cost of the whole Tabernacle has been roughly reckoned as about £250,000 of our current money. All the materials were freely given by the people, part no doubt being spoils from Egypt. The laver is specially mentioned as having been made of the mirrors given up for that purpose by the women. (Ex. xxxviii. 8.)

(4) *The Altar.*

The Hebrew word for an altar signifies a place of slaughter; and this name was given to it because the victim whose life was to be presented to God was bound with cords to the horns of the altar, and then slain. In the patriarchal age, an altar seems to have been set up wherever the worshipper happened to be sojourning. There he would call upon the name of the Lord, who sometimes specially manifested Himself on such occasions. (See Gen. xii. 7, 8; xiii. 18; xxvi. 25; xxxiii. 20; xxxv. 13—15.) There are traces of the same system in later days, and the following clause referring to it was inserted in the Mosaic law. "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee. And if thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar," etc. (Ex. xx. 24—26.) Thus stone altars were to be the exception, not the rule; and altars constructed of hewn stone, or with steps up to them, were positively illegal.

The following are the most notable instances of special altars mentioned in the historical books. By God's command an altar was built on Mount Ebal, when the people entered Canaan (Josh. viii. 30—32); and burnt-offerings, together with the fat and blood of peace-offerings, were offered thereon. Shortly afterwards an altar was built on the east side of the Jordan, by the two-and-a-half tribes; but only as a witness, not for use. It was distinctly understood at the time by both parties, that all

Digitized by Google

offerings were to be offered "before the Tabernacle." (Josh xxii. 26—29.) Gideon built an altar where the angel appeared to him (Judges vi. 24), and Manoah on a similar occasion used a rock for an altar. (Judges xiii. 19—22.) The people of Israel built an altar at Mizpeh (Judges xxi. 4), whilst the house of God was at Shiloh. Samuel built one at Ramah (1 Sam. vii. 17), and there the events connected with the anointing of Saul must have taken place. Another altar was built either by Samuel, or before his time, at Gilgal. (1 Sam. x. 8; xi. 15; xiii. 9.) This afterwards became the scene of idolatrous worship, as was the case with the ancient altar at Bethel. (See Hosea xii. 11; Amos v. 5.) In 1 Sam. xiv. 35, we are told that "Saul built an altar unto the Lord: the same was the first altar that he built unto the Lord." Was this, then, an act of negligence on Saul's part? Ought he to have built an altar earlier in his career? It is noticeable that the priest was in attendance on this and other occasions for purposes of consultation, and it may have been a generally understood rule that wherever God revealed Himself through the agency of the ephod-wearing priest, there was a suitable place for the erection of an altar. Certainly, wherever the ark was, there an altar might be built. Hence we read of the offering of burnt-offerings and sacrificial feasts at Bethshemesh. (1 Sam. vi. 14, 15.) The altar on this occasion was a great stone, as was the case with Saul's altar at Ajalon. When David brought the ark into his own city, he presented offerings there (2 Sam vi. 13—17); and Solomon offered at the same place. (1 Kings iii. 15.) It may be added that the altar set up on Ornan's floor was built by David, owing to special instructions received through the prophet Gad. (2 Sam. xxiv. 18—25.) Its position determined the site of Solomon's Temple.

All the altars of God which had been set up in the land at various times were thrown down in later days, and were supplanted by heathen altars erected in honour of Baal, and other false gods. Hence Elijah complains, "The children of Israel have forsaken Thy covenant, *thrown down Thine altars*," etc. (1 Kings xix. 14.) Accordingly, when the people were gathered together on Mount Carmel, the first thing the prophet did was to repair the altar of the Lord that was broken down; and he took twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob, and with the stones he built an altar in the name of the Lord. (1 Kings xviii. 30—32.) We may gather from these words, that the altar was considered as representative of the people for whose benefit the offering was to be made. The altar at which Aaron and his sons ministered, and at which all the offerings of the people were to ascend, consisted of a framework of wood overlaid with bronze plates, four and a half feet high,

Digitized by Google

and seven and a half feet square, with a grating sunk to half the depth in the middle, to receive the wood and the parts of the victims. (Ex. xxvii. 1—8.) The altar in connection with Solomon's Temple was much larger. (2 Chron. iv. 1.) The altar of incense, which was a totally different structure, and which was used for a very different purpose, will be described in a later section.

(5) *High Places.*

High places, which are often spoken of by the prophets in terms of reprobation, because they were used for idolatrous purposes, seem to have been in the first instance mounds upon which the altars were built. Such, no doubt, was the high place at or near which Samuel held the sacrificial feast outside his city. (1 Sam. ix. 25.) Such, too, was the high place in Gibeon where Solomon sacrificed. (1 Kings iii. 4.) The reason for this course, which was evidently held as not unlawful, is thus given (ver. 2): "The people sacrificed in high places, because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord until those days." When the permanent Temple was built, the necessity, and consequently the permission to sacrifice in high places was done away with. From that time it is spoken of as a dereliction of duty on the part of certain Kings of Judah, that they did not take away the high places: "As yet the people did sacrifice and burn incense on the high places." (See 2 Kings xiv. 4; xv. 4, 35.) We are told of King Ahaz, that he not only walked in the abominations of the surrounding heathen, but that he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree. (2 Kings xvi. 4.) King Josiah, on the contrary, put down the *chemarim*, or idolatrous priests, whom the Kings of Judah had appointed to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem; and also those that burnt incense to Baal and to the heavenly bodies. He brought all the priests out of the cities of Judah, and defiled the high places where they had burnt incense, from Geba to Beersheba, and brake down the high places of the gates that were at the entering in of the city. Nevertheless, it is added, the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren. (2 Kings xxiii. 5—9.)

(6) *The Continual Offerings.*

The ordinary, or continual services of the sanctuary, according to the Law of Moses, were as follows:—

Every morning the priest had to offer a lamb for an ascending

Digitized by Google

or burnt-offering, and with it a meat or wheaten-offering, and a libation, or drink-offering of wine. The same offerings were presented in the evening, in the afternoon,—literally, "between the two evenings." Also incense was to ascend to God from the altar of incense, morning and evening. (Num. xxviii. 2—8.)

On the Sabbath day there was an additional offering of two lambs, with a double wheaten-offering and libation. (Num. xxviii. 9, 10.)

At the beginning of the month, the special ascending-offering was to consist of two bullocks, and one ram, and seven lambs, with a wheaten-offering and libation for each. Also there was to be a kid, for a sin-offering.

There were several annual feasts. On the fourteenth of the first month was the Passover. On the fifteenth came the feast of unleavened bread, which lasted for seven days. (Num. xxviii. 17.) On each of these seven days (*i.e.*, the 15th to the 21st of Abib) there were to be offered two bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs, with their wheaten-offerings, and a goat for a sin-offering. On the first day and on the seventh there were to be holy convocations, by which we are probably to understand solemn assemblies.

Special offerings were ordered in connection with the presentation of the first sheaf of corn which was waved (Lev. xxiii. 12), and with the feast of ingathering, fifty days afterwards. (Lev. xxiii. 15—21; Num. xxviii. 26—31.)

On the first day of the seventh month there was to be the sounding of trumpets, and a special additional ascending-offering of a bullock, a ram, and seven lambs; also a kid for a sin-offering. This was doubtless to prepare the minds of the people for the solemnities which were appointed for the tenth. This day was to be kept as a public fast, a day on which the people were to afflict their souls. (Num. xxix. 7; compare Ps. xxxv. 13.) No work was to be done. There was to be a special ascending-offering, as on the first day of the month, and also a kid for a sin-offering. Afterwards the rites peculiar to the great day of atonement were to be observed. This also was the day on which in every fiftieth year the trumpet was to be sounded, in order to announce a general release from the burdens on the land, and from personal servitude. (Lev. xxv. 9, etc.)

On the fifteenth of the same month, the week of festivity, generally called the feast of tabernacles, was to begin. On the first day *thirteen* bullocks were to be offered, with two rams, fourteen lambs, with their wheaten-offerings and libations, and a kid for a sin-offering. On the second day *twelve* bullocks, and all the rest the same as before; and so the number of bullocks was to diminish day by day, so that by the seventh day they

Digitized by Google

were brought down to seven, the rest of the offerings being all the same each day. The eighth day (*i.e.*, the 22nd of the month) was to be a solemn assembly, free from servile work, and was to have the same peculiar offerings as were appointed for the first of the month.

Such were the leading occasions on which offerings were to be made to the Lord, exclusive of those which were prompted by peculiar circumstances, exclusive also of sundry rites of great interest not now calling for remark.

(7) *How far was the Levitical System carried out?*

It is impossible to ascertain whether these ordinances were fully carried out by the people. *Whilst* the Israelites were in the wilderness they were very lax in their observances (Deut. xxxii. 15—18), and the Lord, speaking by the mouth of Amos (v. 25), asks the question whether His people really did offer sacrificial feasts and wheaten-offerings in the wilderness during their forty years sojourning. St. Stephen, in quoting this passage, seems to imply that the Israelites had neither kept the Mosaic Law whilst in the wilderness, nor afterwards. On the other hand, there are several indications in the historical and prophetical books of the Old Testament, that the Levitical Ritual in some of its leading features was sustained from the days of Joshua up to the time of the captivity, and was reinstated after the people returned. Thus in the days of the idolatrous Ahaz, we find the King ordering the priest to burn upon the great altar the morning ascending-offering and the evening wheaten-offering, and the King's ascending-offering and His wheaten-offering, with the ascending-offering of all the people in the land, and their wheaten-offering, and their libations; and to sprinkle upon it all the blood of the ascending-offering, and all the blood of the sacrificial feasts. (2 Kings xvi. 15.) After King Hezekiah had purified the sanctuary, he "appointed the courses of the priests and the Levites after their courses, every man according to his service, for ascending-offerings and for peace-offerings, to minister, to give thanks, and to praise in the gates of the tabernacles of the Lord. He appointed also the King's portion of his substance for the ascending-offerings; to wit, for the morning and evening offerings, and for the Sabbaths, and for the new moons, and for the appointed festivals, as it is written in the Law of the Lord." (2 Chron. xxxi. 2, 3.)

In the third chapter of Ezra it is stated that when the seventh month came, the people gathered themselves to Jerusalem; the altar was rebuilt, and offerings ascended from it every morning and evening. "And they kept the feast of tabernacles as it is written,

Digitized by Google

and offered the daily ascending-offerings by number, according to the custom, as the duty of every day required. And thenceforward they kept up the continual ascending-offering, those of the new moons and of all the set feasts of the Lord, those also of every one that voluntarily offered a free-will offering unto the Lord." (See also Ezra vi. 3—9.) In Nehemiah a variety of particulars are given about the mode in which the Levitical office was to be kept up, the people pledging themselves to provide a third part of a shekel yearly for the service of God's house, for the shewbread, and for the continual wheaten-offering and ascending-offering, for the Sabbaths, for the new moons, for the set feasts, for the holy things, and for the sin-offerings. Thus the leading features of the Levitical Ritual were retained amongst the people after the Restoration, and were continued, with some modifications, up to the taking of Jerusalem by Titus.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

AN EXPOSITOR'S NOTE-BOOK.

An Expositor's Note-book; or, Brief Essays on Obscure or Misread Scriptures. By Samuel Cox, Author of "The Private Letters of St. Paul and St. John," etc., etc. Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

IN a short preface to this volume Mr. Cox insists upon the necessity, in order to a just and full exposition of any one of the books of Holy Scripture, of having in some good measure mastered them all,—so closely and inseparable are they bound, each to the other. As the result of much laborious and patient investigation of Holy Scripture, continued throughout the course of many years, Mr. Cox confesses his own incompetence,—a confession in which those who know most of the depth of the meaning of the Bible, and of their own inability to fathom it, will be the foremost to join,—to expound any book, or even any passage of Holy Writ, in such a manner as to extract its full meaning. In the volume before us he has endeavoured to render some portions of the sacred volume more clear and attractive to those who cannot give it the serious and continuous study which it demands. In some cases we think that our author has accomplished the end at which he has aimed; in other cases we think that the relief which the composition of these pages has afforded him from "graver and more exhausting labour" has been purchased too much at the expense of his readers, inasmuch as some of the expositions offered bear very

Digitized by Google

few traces of the clearness, the thoughtfulness, and the ability which characterize Mr. Cox's other writings.

In his translations of many of the passages which he has had occasion to expound, and herein we refer more particularly to those which are found in the Old Testament, Mr. Cox has, in our judgment, succeeded in imparting to his readers a much more accurate conception of the meaning of the original than they could obtain from the Authorized English Version. Many also of his explanations and elucidations are well deserving of consideration, not only at the hands of the ordinary English reader, but also at those of the Biblical student. We must, however, enter our decided protest against the tendency which we discover in this book to inspire doubts in the minds of its readers as to the literal truth of portions of the sacred history, and to encourage lax notions as to the nature and extent of the inspiration under which some portions of Holy Scripture were composed. We will illustrate our meaning by reference to one or two particular instances.

In an interesting paper upon Gen. iv. 7, entitled "The Croucher at the Door," with which the volume before us opens, Mr. Cox refers to that exposition of the record of the first transgression, which regards it "not as history, but as parable,—not as a literal narrative of fact, but as a dramatic expression of the general human experience," not indeed as directly endorsing that exposition, but without any intimation of dissent from it, or any allusion whatever to the disastrous results with which the admission of such a method of exposition must be fraught. Such interpretations of any portions of Holy Scripture which are conceived in the terms of plain and simple narrative, and without any intimation of their being susceptible of a parabolical exposition, appear to us to be inconsistent with any sound canons of Biblical exegesis. In cases, like that in question, in which direct reference is made by the writers of the New Testament to the account of the Fall, as a matter of history, and in which doctrines of the highest importance are inseparably connected with the facts of that history, it seems to us that any explanation which calls in question the literal occurrence of the facts as they are represented in the sacred narrative, not only involves an erroneous principle of interpretation, but is inconsistent with any just theory respecting the inspiration of those writers who received the narrative as history, and who based doctrinal or practical inferences upon it as so regarded. Mr. Cox affirms, indeed, that the story thus interpreted must be confessed to be an "over-true story," and that it "reflects the common experience of mankind." In our judgment, on the contrary, it ceases to be a true story in the only sense of the word; and so far from being designed to *reflect*

Digitized by Google

the common experience of mankind, if in these words Mr. Cox has reference to the experience of mankind in a state of corruption, it was designed, as we believe, to teach the grand and fundamental truth, that whereas man was originally created in a state of uprightness, the many inventions to which he has subsequently become a prey were the direct result of his own wilful transgression.

Our second illustration shall be taken from Mr. Cox's paper, entitled "Power on the Woman's Head because of the Angels." We differ from very many of the views which he has propounded throughout the course of this paper. Our special and strongest exception, however, is taken to his assertion,—first, that that explanation of Gen. vi. 1—4, which regards "the sons of God" as denoting the angels, is nothing more than a "Hebrew legend;" and secondly, that St. Peter and St. Jude undoubtedly, and "probably" also St. Paul "adopted" this legend, and founded their allusions to the passage in Genesis upon an interpretation which has no solid basis upon which it can be maintained. The difficulties attending the interpretation of the passage itself are well known, and they are too great and too numerous to admit even of discussion in a notice like the present. Our position is simply this. A just idea of the nature of inspiration seems to us to be inconsistent with the theory that inspired Apostles not only misconceived the meaning of Old Testament Scripture, but based their allusions to it upon such misconception.

It is with real regret that we feel constrained to direct the attention of our readers to blots, such as those to which we have now referred, in the writings of a man of Mr. Cox's undoubted learning and ability, to which, in our review of one of his more recent productions, we have gladly borne witness in a late number of this journal. If we have unintentionally misrepresented in any degree our author's meaning, we shall most readily accept any explanation of it which he may think well to offer, should these pages meet his eye. Our regret is the more hearty, because these are days in which the demand for such contributions to Biblical exegesis, as Mr. Cox has shown himself well fitted to supply, is probably greater than at any previous period in English history; and it is, therefore, of pre-eminent importance that those at whose lips and from whose pens the people seek the interpretation of the Divine law, should be men who not only "keep knowledge," but who also "hold fast the form of sound words."

Digitized by Google

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Christian Observer and Advocate.*

Dear Sir,—Very delightful has the perusal been to me, and I trust to many of your readers, of the article on "Worship," which stands first in the Magazine for this month. (February.)

To give a spiritual tone and a devotional character to all our public worship is, to my mind, what is so much needed at the present time. Much as our Liturgical Service aids that spirituality and devotion when solemnly and suitably used, it is melancholy to think how much may be lost by the mode in which the prayers are read, and the psalms and hymns sung in many of our churches. Mr. Richardson's excellent article will, I trust, kindle a desire in those who read it, that their worship may be a "product of the spirit and of the understanding also."

But there is one thing in regard to our public services which seems to me worthy of consideration, if such be our desire; and that is, the mode or manner in which our devotional services are led. It has, unfortunately, in these days become common even in churches where the ministry is truly Evangelical, for the officiating minister to read the Lord's Prayer and those very solemn portions of the service, the Creeds, in so rapid a manner that it is impossible to follow with attention and solemnity; and this is especially so where the choir is permitted to take the lead in the responses and other parts of the service. An idea seems to have sprung up of late, apparently, that a choir of youths is an essential means of inducing the congregation heartily to join in the responses and music; but, in my judgment, nothing is more likely to defeat that important object than to allow a choir of school boys, however well trained, either too audibly to lead the responses or to take the most prominent part in the singing.

I know a church in London where the choir is as well trained as it can possibly be, and yet when the Lord's Prayer is read and the Creeds are recited it is quite impossible for a devout mind to follow, without distraction, in those sacred portions of our holy worship. Far different did I find it in a large church in one of our southern watering places, where I happened to worship last Lord's day. There the organ and choir were made subservient to the earnest and audible outpourings of the hearts of the congregation; aiding in psalmody and blending in the prayers, the voices of the choir proved a means of promoting a cordial spiritual worship, such as one delights to enjoy in the house of God.

In the London church to which I have alluded, a practice of chanting the whole of the Psalms has been adopted, and by this

Digitized by Google

means much of the solemnity of this part of our service is lost; for such of the congregation as cannot follow the choir are denied the benefit of that union in the alternate utterance with the minister of those portions of Holy Writ, to which we have been so long accustomed.

I hope I shall not offend any faithful minister who may have been led to sanction these things, probably without a thought of any evil ensuing. But it certainly has seemed strange to me that under the eye and ear of ministers, truly devout themselves, and sincerely desirous that their congregations should worship "in spirit and in truth," such things should exist; tending, as they do, to diminish that "solemn, solid, scriptural enjoyment of God's favour" in His house of prayer, to which your article refers.

May I then, without a spirit of dictation or dogmatism, draw the attention of your clerical readers to these considerations?

Let it be weighed in their minds whether congregations could not be gently induced to a more hearty and consistent utterance of the responses; and to a more perfect form of congregational singing, aided, it may be, by a choir of selected members of the church, instead of by a choir of ill-educated boys, whose loud and peculiar utterance, generally, often injures the very object they are intended to secure. It may not be wondered at that where a mere outward service is deemed sufficient such a state of matters should be unobserved. But where true spiritual worship and the heart's devotion is the object of desire, all that tends to unite as one man the whole congregation, should be studied; and all that distracts or diminshes united prayer and praise most carefully eschewed.

I am, dear Sir,
Yours truly,
A. B.

Feb. 27th, 1875.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Daily Readings for Holy Seasons.—Passion Week. By the Rev. James Scholefield, M.A., late Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge. Easter to Whitsuntide. By the Rev. John Richardson. M.A., of Christ Church, Camberwell. London: Seeley. 1875.—The present books form part of a series which is intended to comprise Lent, and the period from Advent to Epiphany also. The first of these treatises need not long detain us. More than thirty years ago it reached a fifth edition: no matter for surprise, when it was the fruitful meditation of so devout a Christian, and so profound a student of God's Word, as the

Digitized by Google

late Professor Scholefield. Still, in the multiplicity of modern publications, it may recently somewhat have been lost sight of, and we are glad to see it reproduced, clothed in attractive garb forming a fair casket for the contents. Of the companion volume by Mr. Richardson, we may remark that the form of brief meditations suits his peculiar method of enforcing Divine truth, and that there will be found many precious thoughts full of comfort and edification to believers, as they pass in review the solemn events which transpired in the momentous period between the resurrection of the Saviour on Easter-day and the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

The Shadowed Home and the Light Beyond. By the Rev. Edward Henry Bickersteth. London: Sampson, Low. 1875.—Among the many valuable publications with which Mr. Bickersteth has enriched the Church of Christ the present volume will take a chief place. We have read it from first to last with most profound interest and sympathy. It is pure oil olive beaten. Taking our Burial Service for the text of his meditations, and speaking out of the fulness of his own heart, he has embodied in his volume a number of holy thoughts which will be inexpressibly full of comfort to the sons and daughters of affliction in those solemn hours when their need is the sorest. Each portion of the service is commented upon in succession, and its peculiar beauty and fitness made apparent. There are few houses, nay even palaces, into whose windows death has not come up and cut off the children from without, and the young men from the streets. In them the voice of consolation is needed, and we know not where else, saving of course when we are listening to the accounts of the Master Himself, it speaks more cheerfully, or with more assured faith, than in the present volume. We do not think that the author had any secondary aim in view, but over and above that which he has manifestly proposed to himself, his present treatise is a masterly vindication of the glorious service, for such it is, from the cavils of adversaries. It is a display, but not an undue one, of the treasure which the Church of England possesses for her children. May a gracious God infinitely multiply the number of those who shall be counted worthy of them!

King and Commonwealth: a history of the Great Rebellion. By B. Meriton Cording, and J. Surtees Philpotts, Head Master of Bedford School, etc. London: Seeley, 1875.—More than two centuries have elapsed since the close of the Great Rebellion, and yet it is difficult to approach the consideration of it with unbiased mind. It may, however, be averred, without any fear of contradiction, that grievous faults were committed on both sides, and that none but a wild partizan would attempt to justify much which took place. If, however, the aggressor were always a term synonymous with wrong-doer it would be hard to exculpate the Royalists, who, under the Stuarts, whether from incompetency or perversity, roused the fury of the nation beyond all endurance. Plainly, if there had not been resistance to the uttermost English liberty would have had no existence. In the volume under review this is carefully and fully brought out. There is no attempt at concealing or unduly extenu-

Digitized by Google

ating the faults of the Parliamentarians and Puritans, but the importance of the principles which they contended for is fully vindicated. Great judgment has been shown in the topics selected; the narrative is not overburdened with details and incidents which do not contribute to the completeness of the picture, but there is a lucid presentment of all that is essential for an ordinary student to be acquainted with. The book is a pleasant one to read, and is well calculated to communicate most valuable information to intelligent young persons upon a most instructive portion of our history. It has been brought out with especial reference to the Oxford and Cambridge certificate examinations this year, but will be found to be a volume of sterling merit, temperate and impartial.

Natural History Scrap Book.—Morals for Mottoes.—Half-Hour Readings for Sunday Afternoons.—Bible Emblems of our Lord Jesus Christ. London: Religious Tract Society.—The "Scrap Book" is a very handsome volume with excellent illustrations of beasts, birds and reptiles. It is quite fit for a drawing room table; but would be the delight of young folk, to whom it would furnish still more appropriate enjoyment. Profitable reflections are interspersed, so that the reader is led from nature to consider the God of nature in these the works of His hands. "Morals for Mottoes" is a reprint of papers which have already appeared in the *Sunday at Home:* we are glad to see them in a collected form. The idea of converting these morals of heraldry to some useful purpose is an ingenious one, and has been well carried out by Mr. James, to whom we are indebted for this pleasant volume. As somewhat out of the ordinary routine of books of the class it will no doubt meet with more than ordinary acceptance. We would wish to speak in terms of strong commendation of Mr. Milner's "Half-Hour Readings." They profess to be in prose and verse, but the bulk of them are prose. There is a great variety of subjects, but all are treated in a manner suitable for Sabbath reading. The reader will not be led away from the teaching of the Word of God, but will find it enforced and illustrated by many apposite remarks and well-selected illustrations. "Bible Emblems" is a packet of cards: each has some designation of our blessed Lord, with the text in which it occurs. Some appropriate lines are added, festooned with borders beautifully executed. "The Lily" is encircled with lilies, "The Vine" with bunches of grapes, and so on. For a Sunday school they would furnish neat and acceptable rewards at a moderate cost.

The Christian Evidence Journal for 1874. *Edited by B. Harris Cowper.—Popular Objections to Revealed Truth. Third edition.—Disputed Questions of Belief.—Some Present Difficulties on Theology. London: Hodder and Stoughton.* 1873-4. We have grouped these books together as they all deal with the same subject and are all issued by the same publishers. All of them deserve commendation, as valuable helps towards the maintenance of religious belief against the assaults of unscrupulous adversaries. The "Journal" contains a record of the efforts made from day to day in opposition to secularism and infidelity: it also furnishes some valuable papers on subjects which from time to time are impugned by the adversaries of revealed

Digitized by Google

truth. We gather from it some idea of what is doing outside the Church of Christ, and the tactics of its defenders. "Popular Objections to Revealed Truth" are considered in a series of Lectures delivered in the New Hall of Science, by Messrs. Row, Titcomb, Gritton, R. B. Girdlestone, Dr. Gladstone, Allon, Calthrop, Dr. Barry, and others. They have already reached a third edition. It would be a valuable book to put in circulation where infidelity prevails, because it deals, and deals effectively, with scruples and crotchets now entertained. We may add, too, that it is courteous and considerate in tone towards opponents, while plain and outspoken in language. The other two volumes consist of Lectures delivered to young men at the English Presbyterian College in London, by eminent members of that community,—such as Professor Lorimer, Mr. Dyke, Mr. Saphir, and others. They treat of fundamental Christian doctrines and modern phases of unbelief. These are handled in a masterly manner. It may be convenient for those who are troubled with infidelity in their parishes and among their friends, to be informed of the existence of these useful volumes.

Voices of the Prophets. By E. Hamilton Gifford, D.D., etc. Edinburgh: Clark. 1874.—These lectures were delivered in Lincolns' Inn, on the foundation of Bishop Warburton, during the years 1870—4. It may not be amiss to recall the object of the foundation, which is "to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies in the Old and New Testament which relate to the Christian Church, especially to the apostasy of papal Rome." We do not impute it as a fatal defect in Dr. Gifford's lectures, that they have no reference to "the apostasy of papal Rome," for it may not be essential that each and every course of lectures should dwell on this apostasy; but most assuredly it would be a breach of contract if this apostasy is continually ignored in the Warburtonian lectures. We may add, too, that there never was a crisis when an able and argumentative discussion of papal apostasy by divines prominent for learning could be more necessary than at the present time. The wisdom of our forefathers has provided the means: surely it ought to be the duty of some qualified persons to see that the trust is fulfilled as the indenture between the Bishop and the authorities of Lincolns' Inn sets forth. It would be a remarkable and not an encouraging fact, that while the Romish controversy is raging all around its appointed champions should be mute.

The lectures of Dr. Gifford present much which may be termed amiable and ingenious: there is, moreover, in them great reverence for the Word of God, and most distinct recognition that it is a supernatural revelation. It is pleasant to find a most distinguished scholar who is able to speak with authority regarding all the fanciful conclusions which pass for profound criticism, and teaching in full accordance with the revelation made to us in the Scriptures. No one will peruse the volume without finding much to instruct and edify; and so far he has fulfilled his vocation well. There are, however, points upon which we are constrained to differ from him. In his extreme anxiety to uphold what he terms "A moral fitness

Digitized by Google

and harmony between the human character and work of the prophet and a Divine calling,"—a principle which he chiefly desires to illustrate in the course of his lectures,—we cannot help thinking that his advocacy has carried him too far. Even if we could concede to him that he has made out a sufficient case to prove that Caiaphas was not a prophet, which by a confusion of his prophetical with his priestly and official character may be maintained, although not without some difficulty, yet what of Balaam? He too was a prophet (2 Peter ii. 16). But one allusion to this evil man occurs throughout Dr. Gifford's book (p. 199), and that is of a most incidental and cursory character. There is an almost painful significance in his profound silence about one so prominent for the distinctness of his visions, and "whose moral fitness" to be the medium of them was so inharmonious with the Spirit of holiness, of love, and truth. Some explanation ought, we think, to be vouchsafed. It would not be easy to term Balaam's "unconscious predictions." For ourselves, although we cannot doubt that the Holy Spirit has usually and with propriety (if we may venture to use the term) spoken through holy men, yet He has seen fit to make wicked men also the medium of His communications; but to the confusion and overthrow of themselves and those who trusted in them. We prefer, in this matter, recorded fact to Dr. Gifford's theory.

Manuals of Religious Instruction for Pupil Teachers.—English School Classics. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1874.—We have received a further instalment of these useful little books. Of the "Manuals of Religious Instruction" we can speak favourably. They are moderate in theological statement, and a great deal of useful information is embodied in them. Five parts will complete the publication. What we have now before us are Parts III. and IV., which embrace, for the Old Testament, the Psalms and portions of the Old Testament, from the division of the kingdom to its close under Zedekiah. The gospels of St. Luke and St. John are dealt with in the New; and the Catechism, Litany, Communion Service, etc., in the series on the Book of Common Prayer. Others besides pupil teachers, in schools especially, may derive benefit from these Manuals. The "School Classics" comprise selections from the "Spectator," Brown's "Religio Medici," and Macaulay's Essay on "Moore's Life of Byron." The notes are well calculated to lead young persons to read with discrimination and understanding.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE current of public legislation has, upon the whole, been proceeding with tolerable smoothness and regularity. The most serious difficulty during the past month has arisen in connection with the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords. By Bills recently introduced by Lord Selborne and Lord Cairns, appeals had been transferred from the House of Lords to a newly constituted Court of Appeal. This, so far as England was concerned, had been resolved upon; but there still remained the question of extending to Scotland and Ireland the powers of the new Supreme Court of Appeal. By a private understanding come to outside Parliament, the Conservatives objected to what was the policy of their chiefs, and the Scotch and Irish Judicature Bills have been withdrawn. Considerable mystery still attaches to the whole affair, but we fear that the result will not be to augment public confidence in the Ministry.

The Church Patronage Bill, promoted by the Bishop of Peterborough, is making its way through the House of Lords. Serious exceptions have been taken to some of its provisions, which would withdraw suits from the ordinary Law Courts to the new Ecclesiastical Court, established by the Public Worship Regulation Bill.

Lord Lyttleton has introduced a Bill for the increase of the Episcopate, but as there is no provision for any sources of revenue from which the new Prelates are to be paid, it seems doubtful whether, even if it should pass the House of Commons, any practical results would flow from it. Meanwhile Mr. Secretary Cross has brought forward a Bill for the erection of a Bishopric at St. Albans: this has the merit of being a practical measure. The Counties of Essex and Herts are to be transferred from the diocese of Rochester, and the Bishop of Rochester is to assume charge of the parishes belonging to the Winchester diocese, bordering on the south bank of the Thames. This will remove a great burden from the Bishop of Winchester, whose diocese should henceforth be fairly manageable. The funds for the endowment of the new Bishopric will be mainly provided by the sale of Winchester House, in St. James' Square, and the Bishop of Rochester will have some more suitable residence provided than Danbury has been, even when some part of his diocese was circumjacent to his home.

In the Lower House there has been a good deal of excitement in connection with Army matters. A Bill introduced by Mr. Hardy on the subject of Regimental Exchanges, which would go

Digitized by Google

far to neutralize the system introduced by Lord Cardwell, by which bonuses were not permitted, has passed through Committee, notwithstanding the active opposition of Mr. Gladstone. It now remains only to be read for the third time.

In France, the result of the long and anxious debates which have recently occupied public attention has been the establishment of a Conservative republic with a strong Executive, and a strong second Chamber. A Ministry has been formed under M. Buffet. We hope that under the new arrangement France will, at least, have a short breathing time which will enable her in some degree to prepare for the future.

From Spain there is nothing important to chronicle.

The Germans are steadily pursuing their policy of discouraging the arrogant pretentions of the Church of Rome. The Disendowment Bill is meeting with much favour, and will probably shortly become law.

We regret to notice that in the final decision upon the Exeter Rere-dos case, the structure introduced into the Cathedral may be retained. We are sorry for any innovations, however artistic, which serve to confound in the popular mind the Lord's Table of the Church of England with the altar of the Church of Rome.

The Queen has lost an eminent servant and faithful friend by the decease of Sir Arthur Helps, Clerk of the Council, a man deservedly held in much honour.

An eminent Cambridge celebrity, Professor Willis, has also passed away, in a ripe old age.

Two distinguished military men have likewise been removed by death, Field Marshall Sir W. Gomm, and Sir Hope Grant. Conspicuous not only for his military ability but also for his decided profession of Christianity; the loss of the latter will be very severely felt.

We may perhaps be permitted to add to this obituary record the name of the venerable Lady Stephen, whose life-long associations were of the most intimate character with the leading friends who originated and upheld the *Christian Observer*.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limited period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the reduced price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 5. MAY. [1875.

THE BELIEVER: COMPLETE YET INCOMPLETE.

(Paper read at the Cannon Street Conference.)

In all gatherings, as in all teachings, which have for their object the promotion of sound spiritual life, it is of the first importance to look well to foundation truths.

The constant affirmation of these, as St. Paul declares in his letter to Titus, is necessary alike for the manifestation and maintenance of all good works: *i.e.*, all practical holiness. They are our true strength for service; and some of us may possibly find that when, like the giant of old, we can touch this ground anew, we shall rise all the fresher for our conflict, all the more fitly prepared for our onward course.

We are all agreed that although these are days of progress in every direction, they have not yet carried us beyond the Christianity of the New Testament. What that is we may gather at large from the developed teachings of the Epistles. These are, in the truest sense, our "manuals of holiness," the liveliest delineations of the "life, walk, and triumph of faith." Nay, so full and clear are they, that even if we were to confine ourselves to a simple arrangement of the passages which speak of the Believer's present position, it would not be unhelpful. It may be well, however, for the sake of definiteness, to call attention to but one corner of this "field of Boaz,"—to glean from one sheaf, and to endeavour to show from what Paul wished to be, what Paul was; and what we individually may be, and are, if believers: *i.e.*, trusting and resting on Christ. May the Master let fall "some handfuls of purpose" for us!

The Apostle gives us the true Standing of the Believer in Phil. iii. 7—10. We may sum it up very shortly, as one—

I. *Of complete completeness*, as to judicial standing.

II. *Of complete incompleteness*, as to personal standing.

These are truths which should lead us to rise above all the mists

Digitized by Google

of the lower ground, occupy the heights set before us, and take a calm survey of this blessed position.

I. St. Paul affirms, first, that *the believer stands complete in his union with Christ.* He has *won* Him,—has gained Him. He has acquired an interest in His work, an intimacy with His person, a place in His intercession, a pledge of His glory.

But more,—he is *found in Him.*

We should be very clear upon this point of union. It is real, vital, close, profound. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Each several Believer is in Christ as the branch is in the vine, the stone in the building. The link forged by God the Father in eternity is grasped by the hand of faith in time: that faith forms the tie, that faith fixes it. Henceforth we are not two, but one,—indivisibly one. Whilst, however, we are not to think of this oneness as separable, so neither are we to mistake this inseparableness. To use the words of a clear-thinker and most godly man (Hewitson),—"This unity is not a personal, but a federal or corporate unity. . . . It is constituted not by the conversion of two distinct persons into one, but by the indwelling of one and the same Spirit in two, who remain distinct, persons."

We cannot use language too strong or too confident, when we speak of our identity with the Lord Jesus as our Head and Surety; but we cannot use language too guarded, when we come to speak of the nature of this identity. We may hold, on the one side, that all that Christ was as our Representative, *that* we are,—all that He did, *that* did we also; but we must hold, on the other, that there is to be no confusion between the personal and the mystical Christ. We are not Christ Himself, but we are the body of Christ; and so we are one with Him in all those senses of which this unity is predicable.

Now, if complete in this union, *we are complete also in the various effects of it.* Take the one specified here. "We are found in Him, not having our own righteousness, which comes from observance of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God on the ground of faith." We are, then, righteous by virtue of our union with Him. But what is this righteousness? In its simplest form it is "right doing" with respect to law (Deut. vi. 25); "law fulfilment,"—or, if the term is better liked, "the result of law fulfilment." It is that thing which we must have if ever we are to be accepted of God, and be pronounced innocent with respect to His law; but it is just that thing which we cannot have of ourselves,—we cannot produce either a righteousness of obedience, or a righteousness of satisfaction. "The corruption of our nature forbids the one; its condition (as a limited finite state) forbids the other." But what the weakness of the flesh has prevented, that God has in

Digitized by Google

His wise mercy provided. He has brought near His righteousness: that which He has devised, announced, wrought out,—that which He bestows, and having bestowed, accepts.

Now this righteousness of God is not that which we know as the *essential attribute* of His nature, for it is something which a man can have and be. Nor, again, is it merely a *Divine quality communicated* or imposed, for it is continually spoken of as imputed and not inherent. It is the work of Christ: His doing and dying, His one righteous act (the δικαίωμα of Rom. v. 18); not His essential holiness, which is not communicable, but His mediatorial righteousness. It is that one work which commenced with His birth, and culminated in His death; that which comprises satisfaction for our violation of the law, as well as compliance with its commands. This is the portion of every believer, however young or however feeble: this is the Christ which all put on who are truly baptized into Christ. In this each stands forth as a justified person: not only acquitted, but accepted; not only innocent, but entitled to positive reward; not only completely reconciled, but completely restored to privilege.

We are "made the righteousness of God in Him;" for "in Him and by Him every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the law." In Him we are *dead* to all imputed sin. It is no longer on us, no longer set to our account. Judgment for it is behind us: we are crucified with Christ. In Him we are *buried*, our past history with all its blots entirely put out of God's sight. In Him too we are *alive* unto God, adopted into His family, sealed with His Spirit, seated in heavenly places. For in His eyes, as in His purpose, no single seat in heaven is vacant. These no doubt are very familiar things, but we must not let our familiarity with them rob them of their force. They constitute the Believer's Standing on the side of its completeness. That standing we cannot overrate; for we do but stand where God has placed us, just as we are only what that God has made us. Can we add to those words of His, or can we with safety take from them?—"I passed by thee, and looked on thee. I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live. I sware unto thee. I entered into covenant with thee. I washed thee. I anointed thee. I clothed thee. I decked thee with ornaments. Thy beauty was perfect through my comeliness, which I had put upon thee." (Ezekiel xvi.) Yea, "such are we in God's sight, as is the very Son of God Himself!"

Oh, that all who hear it would take it as the direct message of God to them, that "Christ for us paid the ransom by His death, Christ for us fulfilled the law in His life!"—that His suffering and His obedience so transcend all finite suffering and finite obedience, that by it all united to Him are saved, in Him

Digitized by Google

pardoned, in Him righteous, in Him complete. All this Paul wished to be: all this Paul was.

II. But he goes on to speak of a further part of the Believer's Standing,—that which for the sake of contrast I have termed his complete incompleteness. He wished to "know Christ and the power of His resurrection." Can we doubt that he knew in part? And yet after twenty-six years of that knowledge he still speaks of it as incomplete.

Each soul that trusts in Christ is really in the same position. In one sense we are "risen with Christ." Of that there can be no doubt. The Scriptures declare it by type, by inference, by direct statement. (Comp. Joshua iv. 9, 7; Col. iii.; Rom. vi.) And perhaps the truest way of putting our present life before us would be to speak of it as a resurrection-life. As we have passed through a crucifixion, so have we in one sense passed into a resurrection; and what is more,—the *mystical* resurrection has passed into the *moral.*

For as we died unto sin in Christ, and now die to sin in ourselves, so, as risen to life in Christ, do we now walk in the newness of that Christ-life in ourselves. We are alive from the dead, and so far have already experienced something of the power of Christ's resurrection. We are not only raised representatively in Him, but we are actually made partakers of that vivifying power which He, as the Risen One, now sheds forth. For it is in this light that the expression, "The power of the resurrection," is to be viewed. It is not merely the power by which His resurrection was effected; but rather that which He exercises as risen,—the power which comes to us through His resurrection, the fruit of His High-priestly advocacy,—in other words, the power of the Holy Ghost. That Holy One is the sustaining force of all our risen life, as He is, in and through Christ, its originating principle. We are, therefore, already instinct with this life of Christ. To us to live is Christ. That which He received in the day of His resurrection was given to us in the day of our regeneration. The life of Jesus is manifest in our flesh, and therefore we are what we are,—combating if not conquering Christians, for the dying of the Lord Jesus is there. (2 Cor. iv. 10.)

But it is within the limits of the truest Christian experience, as it is within the limits of all Scripture, to say, that our knowledge of this power is not yet complete. There are heights above us which we have not yet climbed, depths beneath us which we have not fathomed, and treasures both in the height and depth which we have not grasped. With Paul, we long to know more of this power, and specially in the direction of its sanctifying operations; for this is the field in which this power of resurrec-

Digitized by Google

tion is chiefly displayed. Our standing here, then, is just this;—we are incomplete in holiness, and therefore desire to know more of that by which it may be advanced in us. We are incomplete, and shall remain so to the end. And what is this but to admit that we are men, not God? Saved men, it may be, but still sinful men. Frame it as men will, there is still sin living in the believer, though the believer may not habitually live in sin. Conquered it has been, but it is not cast out; annulled, but not annihilated: its power broken, but its existence not destroyed. Sin in us, even the best, is an actual fact, and as awful as it is actual. The law in the members wars continually against the law in the mind, and brings us daily into captivity. It clogs our upward movement,—it keeps us back from the free expansion of our spirituality.

Now to meet all this we need a greater supply, a more constant development of antagonistic power, a daily baptism of the Holy Ghost. *Perfect* (τέλειοι) we may be in one sense. We may have reached the moral end (τέλος) for which we were intended,—viz., to be men in Christ. But *perfected* (τετελειώμενοι) we are not.

If our sanctification is complete, in one sense, as a sanctification of state, it is and must be progressive in another, as a sanctification of character. That sanctification is in Christ, as the water is in the fountain; and He must give forth, and we must draw, the fresh daily supply. But we must not let imputed righteousness pass into imputed holiness, and so take the place of personal and practical holiness; for if men can once persuade themselves that Christ has in every way acted for them, and will continue so to act, they are—we will not say intentionally, but—insensibly apt to discharge themselves from obedience to law. It is here, then, that the proportion and balance of truth are not to be forgotten. The corrective checks drawn from the breadth of Scripture must be conscientiously applied. Personal growth and personal advance are not only possible, but necessary. The "child" should become the "young man," the "young man" attain the ripeness of the "father." The Children of Israel are to "go forward," and follow after holiness in a hound-like pursuit of it. "He that says he has holiness enough never had any!" "He (adds S. Bernard) is by no means good who does not wish to be better; and where a soul begins to be unwilling to become better, there it leaves off to be good." There must be progress; and the power for it is at hand.

For it is observable that one part of a Believer's Standing is made to bear upon the other,—that the completeness acts upon the incompleteness: and in this way. That Holy One who is the product, if we may so call it, of the resurrection of Jesus, is in His turn the producer of resurrection-life in us. This He

Digitized by Google

effects by making that resurrection,—first, in its actual, and then in its representative aspect,—a means of life.

He takes first of this thing of Jesus,—this fact, and shows it to us. He points to it as the seal of the Father's satisfaction, the crowning proof of the finished and accepted work. He declares that the Father raised Him from the dead and gave Him glory, that our faith and our hope might be in God. Thus He liberates the soul from the entangling bondage of fear and death, and empowers it for a loftier and more heavenly existence. The risen Christ becomes the raising Christ; and in this way, through the faith of the operation of God (*i.e.*, the resurrection) do we arise. Nor is this all. The same Holy One next takes of our resurrection in Christ, and makes that a powerful lever for newness of life. That old question, "Has Christ died, and shall sin live?" is followed by another,—"Have you risen with Christ, and shall not your affections be set on things above, your members mortified as to things which are on the earth?" Why should you retain, still more why should you replace, the fetters from which you have been delivered? Why should you, taken out of one service and placed in another and a better, prove unfaithful to your new Master? If you are risen, rise. If you are alive, live. If you are freed from sin, and become servants to God, have your fruit unto holiness.

Thus He, who is the power of the resurrection, makes that resurrection a power in its turn. Grasping the promises, we cleanse ourselves from the filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit. With the increase of His operation comes increase of faith; with increase of faith comes increase of victory: for there is always an increase of the Christ within from the Christ without. It is the true pathway of power. And therefore it is that we want to know both Him and it more and more, that the life and likeness of God may be produced in these souls of ours, for that is the only true sanctification.

Such, then, is one view of the Believer's Standing, as drawn from the passage before us. It is complete on one side,—it is not complete on the other. The perfect righteousness of Christ is not the perfected righteousness of the Christian, though it leads very mainly to it. If we realize the one, we shall obtain largely the reality of the other. In proportion as we can reckon ourselves dead to and discharged from sin, we shall be able to break from its fetters. The change of state once felt, will bring about a change of character. For this then let us live, for this let us labour,—looking to and leaning upon Jesus, and daily endeavouring ourselves to follow the blessed steps of His most holy life. Only let us be sure that we desire holiness more than the name of it; not the specious imitation of some fellow-creature,

Digitized by Google

however highly in repute, not the self-imposed conformity to external ritual, however elaborate and correct. These things are not of the essence of holiness. That is rather an aggregate of littles, and such littles as do not readily catch the eye,—little submissions, little self-denials, little self-restrainings, little services for others, little separations from the world. What extent or degree of such holiness is at present attainable, we know not; but this we know,—that we are to aim at a complete assimilation to our God, in knowledge, in true righteousness, and above all, in love. And how long a time may be required for the development of this assimilation, we know not; but this we know,—that He who made the world, and brought out order, beauty, and fruitfulness by a word, can so deal with the world of our heart as to make it pass at once into the fulness of perfection when He requires it to appear before Him. This we know,—that if He makes us faithful, He will keep us fruitful, and at last present us faultless before His presence with exceeding joy. May He seal us now with His likeness, that with that likeness we may be satisfied—*when we awake.*

PROMENADE AUTOUR DU MONDE.

Promenade Autour du Monde, 1871. *Par M. le Baron de Hübner. Ancien Ambassadeur, Ancien Ministre. Auteur de Sixte Quint. Paris: Hatchette et Cie.* 1873.

How common-place an event a voyage round the world has become was amusingly illustrated by a conversation which we lately overheard. The subject under discussion was the transit of Venus; and one of the party casually observed, somewhat interrogatively, that one of Cook's voyages had been undertaken for the purpose of observing that important phenomenon. The other replied that he did not think that so scientific an object had prompted any of those expeditions; and the dialogue had proceeded to some length, the first speaker claiming for his hero a high standing in the world of science, when it was discovered that one was speaking of the celebrated circumnavigator, the other of the illustrious inventor of "Cook's Tourist's Parties." And the extraordinary change which has taken place since the days of Cook and Anson is illustrated by the very title of the book before us. It was then "a voyage round the world," in every sense of the word: it is now what the French language well expresses but ours does not. It is certainly not a voyage:

Digitized by Google

it is not a journey; for that seems to imply something of labour and fatigue by land rather than sea. The word trip is, on the other hand, too trifling. The word excursion, perhaps, comes nearest to it; but implies rather a deviation from a prescribed route. The French word "promenade," applicable to all kinds of locomotion, and conveying a certain sense of leisurely enjoyment, appears to us to be the only one thoroughly descriptive of those expeditions round the world, which can now be arranged with so much ease and carried out with so much comfort. Among the mass of literature to which the frequency of such expeditions has given rise, the book before us deserves to be distinguished, as having many claims on our attention. It is written in a light and agreeable style; and conveys the impressions of one who, as having taken part in public life, was competent to form intelligent opinions in regard to the institutions of the countries he visited, and as an author was able to express them. Baron Hübner was known in public life as an ambassador and minister; and in literature as the author of the "History of Sixtus V.," a work which we reviewed a few years back in the *Christian Observer*.

"Western America, beyond the Rocky Mountains and the virgin forests of the Sierra Nevada, where civilization is carrying on a contest with savage nature,—Japan, the empire of the rising sun, where a few remarkable men are endeavouring to launch their country on the stream of progress,—China, and its passive obstinate resistances to the moral, political, and commercial encroachments of Europe,"—these are what the Baron says he went to see and sketch, and are what many of our own countrymen have seen and described. But the Baron's remarks, as those of a foreigner, have a particular value for us, whenever they have reference to our Anglo-Saxon brethren, or to our own institutions in various parts of the world; and if, when we read his pages, the thought will involuntarily arise, "*quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris*," we feel that it is wholesome to learn how these labours are viewed by an impartial witness. As the traveller was sufficiently familiar with our language to enjoy the society of our trans-Atlantic brethren, and to appreciate some of their peculiarities, we are interested in observing how far his descriptions agree with those of our own countrymen, which we are apt to mistrust as being perhaps tinged by our insular prejudices; and we are pleased to read opinions which will be received on the other side of the water without the impatience and irritation which the criticisms of members of the same family, in individuals or nations, are wont to excite.

Starting from our shores by the Cunard line, the Baron landed at New York; and following the line of the Great Pacific Rail-

Digitized by Google

way, traversed the Continent of North America to San Francisco. From thence he proceeded by one of the steamers of the Pacific Company to Yokohama; and after visiting the principal ports of Japan and China, especially the treaty-ports, returned by what we call "the overland route" from Hong-Kong to Marseilles. The reader may accompany the traveller with pleasure and profit. The descriptions of the voyages, and of the mixture of nations, who from Europe were seeking America, and of those who from America were seeking Japan and China, are lively and pleasant reading. The descriptions of New York, and San Francisco, the great termini of the line,—of Chicago, the great central port, and of that remarkable excrescence of civilization, the Salt Lake City,—are particularly good; and we shall have occasion to quote a few passages as illustrations of the author's style: but to us the interest of the book, at least of the first portion of it, centres much in the Baron's views of American Society, and of the future of that great country. We may have read deeper works on the great questions which are in progress towards an unknown solution in American politics than the lively notes of a journey which occupied just nine weeks; but we do not remember to have read one which has shown more vividly how great and how pressing those questions are.

We, of this country, watched the great struggle between North and South with so deep an interest that our attention is still naturally fixed on the present state of the combatants; and we long to know whether the effects of time are to heal or to widen the breach between those two divisions of our own brethren. But we have, for this very reason perhaps, been less observant of a wider distinction growing up silently between East and West,—a distinction not of parties in one race, but of nations. The enormous preponderance of Germans and Chinese over the Anglo-Saxon race in the immigration to the Western States is a fact which must form an important element in all speculations as to the future of the American Union. The extracts which we shall make will be selected principally with reference to this deeply interesting question.

But we must begin with one or two specimens of the author's descriptive style. The following, for instance, marks a feature in American town aspects, which we do not remember to have seen noticed before:—

"What particularly strikes me at New York is the number of edifices devoted to the most varying forms of worship. I am not speaking of the large Gothic Church which the Irish are building at the present moment; and which is evidently due to another order of things, and to another order of ideas. It is the small places of worship, of every denomination, often built with a vast display of

Digitized by Google

wealth, in all possible and impossible styles, that fix my attention and excite my curiosity. Of modest dimensions, they appear still smaller than they really are by the side of the comparatively vast habitations which they jostle. In Europe, the massive body of the cathedral, the clock-towers, the gables, and the high-pitched roofs of the other churches, stand out in profile against the sky, tower over the habitations of the faithful, and give to each city, when seen from a distance, its own peculiar stamp. At New York it is just the contrary. Viewed from the river, or from Jersey-City, where you land in coming from Europe, this Metropolis gradually presents to you enormous masses of brick,—red, grey, and yellow. Two or three steeples at the outside rear their heads above the roofs, which at that distance are all blended together, appear all of the same height, and stand out from the sky in one single immense horizontal line. Europeans, on first arriving, ask themselves how two or three churches can supply the wants of a million of Christians. They find out their mistake on entering the city, especially in the neighbourhood of Fifth Avenue, where the life of business dies out,—where, at any rate, it bears sway less exclusively, and makes way for diversion, for repose, for study, and even in some small degree for meditation and prayer. Not that all these small churches impress upon Fifth Avenue the stamp of holiness and retirement which seldom fails to strike us when we traverse the floor of one of our cathedrals. Far from this, the '*sanctitas loci*' is utterly wanting in this great and worldly avenue. These small constructions, though dedicated to Divine worship, rich though they are, form, so to speak, but an accessory. They are only open during service; and the service is held, I believe, only on Sunday. But they do exist; and modest though they are, they give proof of the existence of some religion, at least, in the lower depths of the hearts of these men of wealth; who, while they were working to make their fortunes, had little time to spare for the aspirations of the soul; but who, after they have become millionaires, call to mind that they have such a thing. Whether from conviction and from a felt necessity, or from a feeling of propriety and respectability, they then contribute liberally towards the formation of a congregation and the construction of a church." (P. 28.)

Passing from the capital of the East, which evidently still bears the impress of its Dutch founders and their Puritan successors, to that of the West, which has sprung up within our own days,—from New York to San Francisco,—we have the following striking contrast:—

"To return to San Francisco. I love the modest homes of the middle class. They too have their merit. They are seldom without a small garden, or a basket filled with roses and fuchsias. The gardens of the wealthy, though of small extent, are well laid out. There is always a small lawn, beautifully watered, and a great variety of flowers, which the mildness of the climate allows to be cultivated and renewed all the year through.

Digitized by Google

"Large hotels and public buildings are the same everywhere, especially in America. The churches are numerous. Two or three of them are beautiful specimens of sacred architecture. The most sumptuous temple is the Synagogue. I name it first because it stands upon one of the highest points of the city; it catches the eye more than any Christian building; and, let it be observed in passing, attests the local importance of the Jewish element. Saint Mary's, the Roman Catholic Cathedral, is a beautiful and noble Gothic structure. St. Ignatius bears the stamp of the style of the order to which it belongs. Then there is St. Francis. The Protestants of various denominations possess churches of considerable size. Nor must we forget the two josshouses, the pagodas of the Chinese. One significant circumstance is the date of almost all these churches, whether Protestant or Catholic. It is almost invariably 1854 or 1855. This was the exact time when the Committee of Safety began its functions. While they were waging war against the malefactors, the peaceable inhabitants had time to remember that they were Christians. Collections were made, and the laying of the first stone coincided with the establishment of public order. The schools belong to the same period. The architecture lavished on these buildings appears to me exaggerated and out of place."

One point in the social condition of the States which most forcibly strikes our traveller, and to which he most frequently recurs, is the absence of that equality which republicanism professes, but which he finds neither among different races, nor in the ranks of the same race,—certainly not in the cities, and not even in the wilds. From New York to California the remark is repeated.

"At New York," he writes, "all is interesting. I do not say that all is charming. One is never tired of watching the constant, excited, feverish bustle, which throughout the morning prevails at Broadway and in Walstreet, or the elegance which towards the decline of day enlivens the beautiful and imposing Fifth Avenue, at that time furrowed by lines of idle walkers and numberless equipages. The luxurious display of carriages, of which many exhibit large armorial bearings on their panels; over-rich liveries; high-priced carriage-horses; the toilettes somewhat 'mirobolante' of the women, more kindly dealt with by nature than by their milliners; the whole scene is more stimulating to curiosity than satisfying. You labour to discover the moral link between this display, which is not afraid on this republican soil to show itself in open day, and that thirst for equality, which is at once the main motive power, the aim, the compass, the reward, and the bane of democratic societies. Undoubtedly this world of fashion is but barely tolerated by the working man, the man in the blouse, who elbows it rudely enough,—the man, as we say in Europe, of the fourth class; but such toleration as it meets with is explained by the hope which every one entertains, and which in this country is

Digitized by Google

not altogether chimerical, of some day reaching the same degree of prosperity,—of seeing his wife, who is to-day washing linen, or rinsing bottles at some gin palace, to-morrow reclining carelessly in a beautiful landau; of himself driving his gig, with a tearing horse, worth five thousand dollars: in a word, of surrounding himself with those material enjoyments, the sight of which, under the idea that he may some day reach them in his turn, excite the craving and the energy much more than the envy of the looker-on.

"For here," the Baron continues, and the remark is a valuable one, "is what distinguishes the democrat of America from the democrat of the old world. The latter despairs of mounting to a higher grade; therefore he seeks to bring others down. The motive power of his moral being is, envy: its action, to level or destroy. The desire of the American is to enjoy. To enjoy, he must make money, which in the new world is always possible and often easy. This done, he forces himself upon the others, as of right; he considers himself the equal of any one of them. Thus his object is to raise himself. He seeks for equality in a higher sphere than that in which he was born, and from which he started. The democrat of Europe reckons on arriving at equality by lowering others to his own level. Of the two species of democracy I prefer the American. But it would appear that here below, in America as in our own hemisphere, equality is a possibility only in theory. Nowhere has this struck me more than in the United States;" and the Baron goes on to confirm what so many of our own countrymen have asserted, "that there exists in America an upper class of refined intellectual society, which the very struggle for political and social equality renders more exclusive than any similar class in any part of the world. Into this class, he observes, his man in the blouse, struggle as he will, can find no entrance. His son or his grandson may perhaps one day be admitted: he is himself shut out. His struggles to force himself in only render the society more retiring.

"The following is the result. People of cultivated mind, of refined manners, with a taste for historical traditions, and consequently for the things of Europe, withdraw in a great degree from public view; form a world apart; avoid, because it is hostile to them, any contact with active life, and those great energies which are developing this immense continent, which discover and turn to account its treasures, which create those marvels which we justly admire. It is allowable to make a display of boundless luxury, because material wealth is accessible to all. It is not allowable to exhibit to the eye of the multitude, which feels that it can never rise to the same heights, the spectacle of intellectual pleasures and refinement of manners. These treasures are carefully hidden, as the Jews of the middle ages used to conceal, as the men of wealth in the East still conceal, the riches of their hearths behind the enclosing walls of an appearance of poverty. . . . . A false impression of American society exists; because while the pushing and pretentious thrust themselves to the front, the true 'gentlemen' and the true 'ladies' pass a life of comparative retirement, and protest by their absence against this pretended equality; and in the large cities of the East,

Digitized by Google

especially at Boston and Philadelphia, form a society more exclusive than the most inaccessible coteries of the courts and capitals of Europe." (P. 21-4.)

Such is the aspect under which democratic equality exhibits itself in the older portion of the Union: let us see whether it assumes a more agreeable form in the wilder portions of the West. The following is a scene at a "rancho," or place of entertainment, at the mines of Yasomite, in California, which our traveller is visiting from San Francisco:—

"In the hall, the father of the inn-keeper, with all the authority that advanced age enjoys in our own German villages, is conversing with a party of men who have just returned, covered with sweat and mud, from the allotments. In this condition they will take their supper with us. They are occupying all the chairs and the bench which extends along the wall. Our excursion-party remain humbly standing. These manners which appear so strange on first arrival have already ceased to shock: one soon gets accustomed to them. What every one does is submitted to as a law." . . . .

In another passage:—

"One sees scenes which would appear incredible if you had not witnessed them. For instance: in the Sierra Nevada, as a general rule, the ostlers, the coachmen, and the servants dine first. They have the same meal as the passengers, and generally at the same table. The latter stand about till these people have finished their dinner. Everywhere they assume the airs of masters. Their insolence would be unbearable if it was not actually ludicrous. And, after all, this hauteur is a sham. It cannot resist the application of a dollar slipped skilfully into the hands of these 'gentlemen.' If this is done, they not only smile upon you benignantly, but what is more important, they carry their affability so far as even to bring you some water to your room, to brush your clothes, or even to clean your boots. . . . What strikes me is not so much the insolence of these wood-cutters and miners as the respectful attitude of my fellow-travellers. There are among them those who by right of social position and education belong to the higher ranks of society in their own country, the Eastern States, and would do so in Europe. When we are by ourselves, they abuse loudly the treatment we have to submit to. But in the presence of the sovereign of the 'rancho' and his vassals, prudence gains the mastery over impatience. They not only hold their tongues, but they do it with a gracious smile. They are not only the faithful vassals, but the humble courtiers of the powers that be. If I note this fact, it is assuredly not in a spirit of fault-finding, or to swell the number of criticisms which one reads on America, which are often unjust and undiscriminating. Each one of us, pitched in some small village of the Sierra Nevada, or of any forest you choose in the far West, would do exactly the same. I quote these instances to prove that absolute personal liberty and social equality are a mere chimera in America as else-

Digitized by Google

where; and that these village kinglings (roitelets) are more exigeant in regard to submission and etiquette than the greatest monarchs of the old world. . . . .

"June 21st. We are called at four. The farm-servants and our coachmen have their breakfasts, as usual, first. Behind the chair of each servant a traveller is standing. He is watching longingly to take possession of the seat as soon as it is free. When the men who have taken their time over their breakfast rise from table, one of the coachmen says to us in a tone of command, 'Eat fast!' Another adds, 'We give you ten minutes: those who are not ready will be left behind!"

If such is the reality of the boasted equality of these republicans in regard to their fellow-countrymen, how does the case stand when different races come into contact? How far does the democratic principle come in aid of our divine religion in softening down the distinction of nations, and that aristocracy which the Duke of Wellington wisely pronounced the strongest of all, "the aristocracy of colour"? Here is an amusing passage which brings the feelings of the Americans towards the coloured class of their fellow-republicans into view in connection with their innate love of rank and titles.

"On the railways a letter of introduction is a most useful thing, especially when travelling alone. The station-master begins the interview by grasping my hand, 'Baron's' me at every word (me prodigue le 'Baron'), and introduces me in due form to the guard of the train. Here the same ceremonies are gone through. The guard *Baron's* me and I *Mister* him. This is the custom of the far West. You never say 'Sir,' but 'Mister,' without the name; for there has been no time to learn this, or you have forgotten it as soon as you did. He is white and an American, and that is enough; for that is enough to prove his superiority over the beasts of the wilds, the red-skins of the prairies, or all the other nations on the globe, European included. It is the race, and not the individual, that is to be considered. He is Mister, and that means master,—master of creation. Duly and formally introduced to the guard, there is yet another form to be gone through, and that not the least important. The guard introduces me to the man of colour, the attendant of the carriages. Now, in consideration of the shade (more or less deep) of his skin, there is no shaking hands. You have not come to that yet, Negro emancipation notwithstanding. You make them legislators and even vice-presidents. At Washington, the seat of central Government, they may pre-occupy, with effrontery enough, the omnibus, and the railway carriage, and seats at places of public resort; and need not make way for any one but women of colour. But to shake hands: oh, fie! It is not to be thought of. The guard as your friend, the man of colour as your servant, make themselves most useful; find you a good seat; enable you to avoid bad or dangerous company by placing you with the

Digitized by Google

ladies, if you can only dispense with your cigar; and secure you a 'section,' that is a window with four seats, which at night will be transformed into a bed-room." (Vol. i., p. 50.)

Such is still the feeling towards the men of colour, notwithstanding all the blood shed in the late war, which if it did not originate in a hatred of slavery, certainly resulted in its abolition. But we must quote a more serious and a more painful passage, which has reference to a race of men of another colour, who appear to be destined by Providence to have an important influence on the future not only of America, but of other parts of the world.

The Baron notes his first contact with the Chinese immigrants as occurring in the neighbourhood of Green River, just before reaching Aspen, at the summit of the pass through the Wahsatch, or westward slope of the Rocky Mountains.

"It is here," he writes, "that the Chinese are first seen. In all the subsequent stations they swarm. Some of them are conversing with the Indians, in what language we know not. Can there be any affinity between these two races? Officers who pass their time in these regions confirm this curious fact, which the science of history has not yet sufficiently accounted for,—that the yellow immigrants make themselves understood by the red-skins better than do the whites."

The following quotation, necessarily a long one, gives the result of the Baron's inquiries regarding this remarkable people:—

"Up to the present time the Chinese have been but birds of passage. Not one of them thinks of establishing himself permanently in America. They all belong to the south of China, the two great provinces Kwantung and Kwangsi, and are of a class superior to that of the Coolies imported from Macao to Chili and Havana. They are for the most part well-to-do peasants. Some have a fair amount of education, some are artizans. A good many bring with them a small capital; all bring strong arms, cheerful dispositions, and a firm resolution to make a moderate fortune. All, as has been said, have left their country with the hope of returning there. In prospect of death, all have made provision for their remains being carried back to the village in which they were born. The return of their bodies forms one part of the contract into which they enter, either with the head of their company or with the Americans who engage them; so that every steamer and sailing-vessel starting for Hong-Kong or Canton carries a cargo of corpses. The emigrants are divided into several 'companies,' the heads of which reside at San Francisco; and according to my informant Fang-Tang, these men exercise a very important influence over their fellow-countrymen. They look after the interests of the new arrivals; settle their disputes amicably; aud in order to avoid recourse to the American

Digitized by Google

tribunals, they exercise, with the consent of the contending parties, a certain amount of even criminal jurisdiction. They afford relief to the sick, assist the living to emigrate, and the dead to return to their country: in a word, they do all that they can to soften the hardships of their fellow-countrymen. Without their constant and essentially paternal intervention, the animosity, only too-well justified, which the Chinese have towards the whites, would break out in acts of violence, and in all probability compromise the very existence of the colony.

"I cannot find words sufficiently severe to mark the conduct of the Californians towards the yellow men. The latter are put almost beyond the protection of the law. Their evidence is rejected by the courts. Those who work at the mines are burdened with a tax of four dollars a month. At the allotments scenes of bloodshed recur periodically. The white diggers pursue the Chinese, drive them from the holdings they have legally acquired, and kill them if they dare to resist. Often they are beaten or stripped without the slightest provocation, and there the matter must end. There is not an instance of a jury finding a verdict against the offenders. Besides, how is the fact to be proved? No white will give evidence against one of his own colour in favour of a Chinaman, and the Chinaman's own countrymen are not admitted as witnesses. Let a rough set of men, naturally given to excess, excited by the rivalry of craft and sure of perfect impunity, consider themselves free from all restraint in regard to their formidable but helpless rivals, and the result is natural enough. But what possible excuse can be made for the members of the Legislature, the judges, and the juries,—men well informed and well educated,—who though perfectly aware of the important services which the Chinese render, and which they are themselves the first to profit by, do not blush to surrender themselves slaves to the evil passions of the multitude. But, alas, this is one of the open sores of the great Republic, especially since it has adopted universal suffrage! Too often justice and morality have to yield to the will of the people. More than once Fang-Tang has spoken to me of the sad position of his countrymen; but always with a moderation and reserve worthy of a statesman of the old school. 'They do not look upon us,' he would say, 'as human beings: this "not good." They would exterminate us as so much vermin: this "very bad."' But he would hasten to add, 'But there are Americans who are not bad; who speak well: only they dare not act as they speak.'

"The whole origin of this hatred is a matter of dollars and cents. At the mines the white receives from three to four dollars and his rations per day. The Chinese labourer receives no rations, and is satisfied with three-quarters of a dollar, or a dollar and half at the outside. It is the same in other employments. In the cities the Chinaman acts as domestic servant, or as washerman or cook. In the country he is first-rate as a cultivator, and especially as a gardener. The terracing which is going on in various parts of the Sierra Nevada is executed by the Chinese. They are the best of workmen. Without their help the line of the Pacific could not

Digitized by Google

have been executed in so short a time. On board the steamers of the great companies, the sailors (and to say the truth, bad sailors enough) are all Chinese. They are more and more superseding the whites. Everywhere they are becoming their competitors. The employers and masters and all who require the help of arms seek the Chinese, because they do nearly the same work as the whites at less than half their wages; and as they are very numerous, and the immigration continues and even increases, their competition tells on the market, and is beginning to lower the price of the manual labour of the whites. This is their crime; and they are made to expiate it by acts of brutality carried even to murder, by legal enactments which are the disgrace of the legislators, and by decisions of juries as contrary to common sense as they are to justice. And still they hold their ground, and nothing daunts them."

"Every one of the large steamers which for the last three years has been making the monthly passage between San Francisco and Hong-Kong, brings from eight to twelve hundred passengers of the yellow race. A number smaller than this returns by the same vessels. These are the emigrants who have served their time. They carry in their boxes the fruits of long and painful labour, in their minds a sovereign contempt for our civilization, and in their hearts a hatred of the Christian."

The Chinese in California are estimated by our author at from eighty to a hundred thousand, of whom from fifteen to twenty thousand are assembled at San Francisco.

The above extracts are sufficient to show that our author's remarks give rise to many speculations as to the future of a country the opposite extremities of which are progressing under influences so widely different. The Anglo-Saxon element, which has given shape to the institutions of the East, is in the West but a slight leaven in the heterogeneous ingredients,—Celtic, Teutonic, and Mongolian (Irish, German, and Chinese),—which are to form some as yet unknown resultant. In the meanwhile the process of amalgamation is not inviting. Among our author's best sketches is one of a Parsee gentleman, who was his fellow-passenger from San Francisco to Yokohama. He had come from China to pay a visit to America, and our author tells the result. Speaking of his fellow-passengers, he says:—

"The most interesting character among us all is, beyond doubt, an elderly Parsee of Bombay. A baker by trade, but the prince of bakers, he supplies the best bread to the European residents at Yokohama, Shanghai, and Hong-Kong. Before the establishments of the lines of steamers, his vessels traversed the seas of China and Japan. He is a person of consideration. The fine head, the beautiful white beard, the dignified carriage, the exquisite politeness, and even the picturesque but quiet dress of the old man, are in harmony with his cast of mind, his wide experience, and his social position. It is well-known that among the Musselmans (*sic.*) the

Digitized by Google

merchants hold the first rank. Our conversations are long and easy, for he speaks English fluently. He had wished, he said, to have a near view of European civilization; and this had taken him to America. He had visited San Francisco, and that was enough. On being quite sure that I was not an American, he admitted that he could not find terms to describe his disgust at all that he had seen. 'The scandalous sights in the streets! The women, and such women: for shame! And the men: what utter want of self-respect! In my country it is very different. The Oriental loves his neighbour. He is kind, obliging, and decent in his behaviour. In the streets of our towns you are never shocked by the sight of drunken men and abandoned women. The American thinks of no one but himself. He is grossly sensual, and gives himself up to excess in the face of day.'

"He had awaited with impatience the departure of the vessel that was to bear him from this distasteful country." (Vol. i., p. 285.)

We must now turn to some of our traveller's experiences and speculations on the great question of North and South. Two or three sketches will enable the reader to see the conclusions at which he arrived, and the grounds upon which they are founded. The scene of the first is a carriage on the Great Pacific Railway.

"The night comes on. We are going at the rate of fifty or sixty miles an hour; but the conversation does not flag. But what a grotesque group we form! There are those attitudes seen only in the far West. I for my part have my head framed in a big pair of jack-boots. They enclose the feet of a tall thin man who is seated behind me, and finds it convenient to stretch his legs over my arm chair. He is a rich farmer of Illinois. He only takes part in the conversation at rare intervals, when his mouth happens not to be full of tobacco; but when he does speak it is with emphasis. 'The Republican form of government,' he says, 'has had its day. What we must have is a dictatorship. There are two classes in the States, those who pay and those who are paid,—the tax-payers and the officials. The first despise and hate the last. Every thing is going to the devil, and a military dictator is the only person who can put us in order.' This discussion was kept up for a long time. In the end all agreed that the Republic must be preserved. 'It is indispensable,' they observed, 'as long as we have waste lands to give away. As soon as America is peopled we must have a military dictatorship.'

"It is not the first time that I have heard this opinion expressed. I am surprised how often the form of Government is discussed. The existing constitution is taken as a fact, and for the time being as a necessity. But no one professes to worship the Republic. Numbers are disgusted with it, and avow it openly. The warmest republicans are found among the newly-arrived Germans, and they are not long in changing their ideas. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that the citizens of the States show any leaning towards monarchy. They suffer from the want of a strong power;

Digitized by Google

and for that reason they talk of a military dictatorship not as a coming event, but as an unrealisable dream. It is very different when you speak of the dismemberment of the great American Empire. Then they warm up: the Northerners because they are determined to maintain the integrity of the territory at all costs and against the world, and the late civil war is a proof that these are not idle words; the Southerners, because they are just as resolved to seize the first opportunity for effecting a separation. This is a subject which is just as well avoided: it gives rise to outbursts of passion, and often to overt acts; for it touches upon interests equally vital and irreconcilable." (Vol. i. p. 93.)

Irreconcilable! Is this indeed the case? Is it a melancholy fact that the Southern States are ever to remain the Ireland or the Poland of the Union, or worse even than this? Such is the sad conclusion which our author draws from all that he saw and heard; and what has since happened in America certainly does not belie his conclusions. The following is one of many passages bearing on the subject. It occurs on the voyage from San Francisco to Yokohama.

"July 11th. A long conversation with a Southerner. The subject, his own country. His are the wails of an Old Testament prophet, and I have not yet met a single one of his countrymen who has not spoken in the same way; but seldom have I heard the sorrows of a patriot expressed in language more simple, more dignified, or more touching. After sketching in bold outline, but in vivid colours, an alluring picture of what the South *was*, he showed me what the civil war has made it,—one entire and vast sore (plaie). A foreigner who has not studied the subject on the spot should naturally suspend his judgment; but considering the unanimity of these lamentations, one cannot but ask oneself whether the best-intentioned men,—whether time, which heals so many wounds,—can find a remedy for ills considered irremediable (at least, under the present state of things) by those who have to bear them. I confess that the arguments of the Northerners, who naturally view things less gloomily, give me no confidence. They reckon on a community of interests; but it was precisely the opposition of interests which gave rise to the insurrection: on the effects of time, to soften down the passions, and modify the ideas and feelings of the generations to follow; but on what are hopes like these founded? are they not purely chimerical? History presents but few instances of a nation justly or unjustly considering itself oppressed being reconciled to its real or supposed oppressors. It may accept its lot with resignation, but the hopes and the hatreds are there. The hostile aspirations and a thirst for vengeance are transmitted from generation to generation. The answer given to this is, 'In the first place the Southerners are not a separate nation; besides, the Southern territory is immense, and the white population is comparatively small. Immigration is extending. The new arrivals are born antagonists of the old proprietors of the soil; that is to say, of our enemies.

Digitized by Google

They will evict them. By degrees they will become the majority. In time they will be masters. The old white population will have disappeared; at any rate it will be of no account. We may well say, then, that time is on our side.'

"I admit the argument. It is a solution which time may bring about; and, barring a separation, it is the only one possible. But for the Southerners it is simple destruction. Like the first inhabitants of the country, the Indians, they will be condemned to disappear, to go out gradually. As long as they may exist, they will resist the new state of things which to them will appear unsupportable and impossible. There must be war, concealed or open. This being the case, I seek, but seek in vain, any elements of reconciliation."

We believe there is only too much of sad truth in these remarks; and we believe that much of the feeling in favour of the South, which certainly existed in England during the civil war, and which excited so much anger in the North, arose from the fact that we in England foresaw this result, which the Americans did not. We were not prompted by any feelings of jealousy towards the Federals; but we as lookers on could see, more clearly than those heated by the contest, the terrible results even of success. We felt that the sentimental argument against a division of the Empire was as true in the mouth of George III. as in that of President Lincoln or any other American; and as the Americans had taught us to discard this argument as invalid, and to look only to the wishes of the people, we doubted whether the Northerners could claim the right to coerce the South, or if anything but misery could attend their endeavour to do so. Experience thus far has not proved that those who so felt were wrong.

We have, we trust, said enough to recommend the work to the attention of our readers. On arriving at Japan, he takes a retrospect of the impressions he has received; and in an apostrophe to the people of America, he offers some remarks on their character and some speculations on their future, which are worthy of careful study, but are too long for quotation. To the great characteristics of the people he does honour, and to the existence of a high-toned and refined society in the Eastern States he bears testimony. But when the effect of universal suffrage and unlimited naturalization has been to drive this class into obscurity, and to place the government of the municipalities and of the State in the hands of adventurers and demagogues,—when the Anglo-Saxon element, which formed the basis of the country, is daily more and more overborne by foreign elements,—the only prophecy upon which he appears to venture is, that only so long as there is unlimited space for expansion can the present state of things last. As long as those dissatisfied can,

Digitized by Google

like the Mormons, move farther on, and carry their ideas into practice, things may go on; but when the exaggerated claims of individual liberty are brought into close contact, when differing religions and different races come to close quarters,—what then? The only answer the Baron ventures to give is that, through whatever "variety of untried being" the country is destined to pass, one thing, and one thing only, is impossible; and that is, monarchy.

The following passage is of deep interest, and must close our quotations:—

"What is wanting is the control of some authority admitted and recognised by all. The complaints which are heard on all sides are all founded on facts of painful notoriety. I cannot give a better resumé of these complaints than by citing the following passage from a book which has just appeared, and of which the authors are American citizens.

"'Any comment would only weaken the force of this narrative, which carries its own lesson. The facts related reveal the rottenness of our social edifice. Not one portion of our organization has proved sound when put to the proof. The Exchange is a hell; the offices of our great companies are secret dens where the managers plot the ruin of their constituents; the law is a deadly weapon at the command of villains; party spirit cloaks itself in the ermine of the judge; the legislative assembly is a mart where laws are sold by auction; and all the time public opinion is either voiceless or impotent.'

"Are not such accusations as these exaggerated? I know not. But this I can affirm, that I have found them in every one's mouth. And the calls for reform are universal. But what reforms? on what basis? within what limits? There is the difficulty. The great reform by which you modified the Constitution, such as it came from the hands of Washington and your first legislators, has brought you no good. By abolishing the qualification which they had the wisdom to establish, and adopting universal suffrage, you have, more or less, handed over your great cities to the sway of the populace,—at all times the most restless, most ignorant, and least respectable of the inhabitants. And now you see the effects. They are least apparent in the West; because there every one becomes a landed proprietor, and in consequence is in a great measure conservative. But in the cities the evil is great. The corruption and venality you mourn are in great part the work of this reform. Sooner or later an attempt will be made to find a remedy: you will try to retrace your steps: but this is always difficult, and often dangerous."[a]

For the present we take leave of our author. We may on

[a] We observe that a translation of this work, by Lady Herbert, has been lately published by Macmillan and Co.

Digitized by Google

another occasion follow him to Japan and China. We have quoted freely his remarks on our brethren, for they are made in a kindly and enlightened spirit. We shall equally value those made on ourselves. And when the writer tells us that he hopes, if God give him life and strength, to devote another year to India, and "there to study the effects produced in the course of a century by the contact of a great Christian nation with the millions of Hindoos and Musselmans subjected to their sway," we heartily hope that this intention may be realized, and we shall endeavour to profit by his remarks.

THE RITUAL CONTROVERSY.

(Continued from page 266.)

The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Published for the Surtees Society. Two vols. Whittaker and Co. 1872.

Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer from Manuscript Sources. Bishop Sanderson and Bishop Wren. Edited by William Jacobson, D.D., Bishop of Chester. Murray. 1874.

Worship in the Church of England. By A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P. Murray. 1874.

The Form and Order of the Consecration and Dedication of the Parish Church of Abbey Dore. Pickering. 1874.

Fasting Communion; Non-Communicating Attendance; Auricular Confession; the Doctrine of Sacrifice; the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Being an Appendix to the Author's Commentary on "The Office of the Holy Communion." By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.C.L., D.D., Dean of Norwich. Rivingtons. 1874.

Ritual Revision. A Letter to the Ven. Edward Bickersteth, D.D. By the Right Hon. John G. Hubbard, M.P. Longmans. 1874.

Letters to the Very Rev. the Deans of York, St. Paul's, Manchester. By William Selwyn, D.D., Canon of Ely. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1874.

Eucharistic Vestments and the Eastward Position. By the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, M.A. Hatchards. 1874.

The Lord's Table, Vestments, and the Eastward Position. A Letter to a Layman. By the Dean of Chester. Hatchards. 1875.

Digitized by Google

The Position of the Celebrant at the Holy Communion. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Winchester. By Morton Shaw, M.A. Rivingtons. 1875.

The Rubrical Question of 1874. *A Brief Historical Inquiry, etc. By C. A. Swainson, D.D., Canon of Chichester. Second edition. Bell and Sons.* 1875.

Notes Concerning the Position of the Minister during the Celebration of the Holy Communion. Northampton: Stanton. 1874.

A Few Words about the Eastward Position. By the Rev. Arthur Wolfe, M.A., Rector of Fornham all Saints, and of Westley, Bury St. Edmund's. Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1875.

A Plea for Toleration by Law, in certain Ritual Matters. By the Bishop of Lincoln. Rivingtons. 1874.

Some Remarks on the Proposal to Legalize the Eastward Position, etc. A Letter addressed by the Bishop of St. Andrew's to A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.

The Convocation of York on the Eastward Position. A Letter addressed by the Bishop of St. Andrew's to the Editor of the "Times."

HAVING cleared the way in our former paper on the Ritual controversy, for the more careful consideration of the two points which more especially divide the English Church at the present moment, we now proceed to put our readers in possession of some of the salient facts, which may lead to a clearer comprehension of the nature of this controversy and of the principles which are involved in its solution.

It might, indeed, appear at first sight, that it is a matter of too much indifference to occupy men's thoughts, whether a clergyman is arrayed in white or in black, in linen or in silk,—in vestments according to the Prayer-book of 1549, or in vestments according to the Prayer-book of 1552. The same remark applies to the question of the position of the minister at the Communion Table, inasmuch as—provided only that the people are able to take their proper part in the service—it matters little, in and of itself, whether the minister turn his face or his shoulder towards them, or whether he look in the same direction with them. These considerations assume the greater importance, inasmuch as the former of the two questions at issue has already been diversely decided by the final Court of Appeal, and inasmuch as we have been warned by no less an authority than Lord Cairns, that the second of the questions must also be considered as *adhuc sub judice*. We wish therefore, to point out to our readers

Digitized by Google

the very clear and palpable distinction which exists between interpretations of the existing law, however contrary to the views and practices of either of the contending parties, and the introduction of a new law which should legalize that which the law, as at present interpreted, expressly forbids. In the former case, supposing the law to be decided in favour of Eucharistic vestments and the eastward position,—without attempting to pronounce what course ought to be, or to anticipate what course actually would be adopted by the aggrieved parties,—we can quite understand the *possibility* of introducing, with beneficial results, an explanatory Rubric to the effect that no doctrinal significance rightly belongs to the adoption of the particular rite or ceremony which may be sanctioned or enjoined. On the other hand, whilst the law remains as it is now declared to be, and both Eucharistic vestments and the eastward position are pronounced illegal, we are prepared to resist to the utmost of our ability any legislation which should legalize either of these rites or ceremonies, or the introduction of any explanatory Rubric which should aim by a side wind at the accomplishment of the same result.

Our objections, indeed, to the latter course are, if possible, still stronger than those which we entertain in regard to the former. As the law is at the present moment interpreted, the use of Eucharistic vestments,—save only in the case of our Cathedrals, and that only on certain occasions,—and the adoption of the eastward position, are expressly declared to be illegal. The introduction, then, of an explanatory Rubric by which either of these practices might be declared to be devoid of all doctrinal significance, and which would virtually have the effect of legalizing such practice, appears to us to be a course replete with danger, the greatness of which it is impossible to exaggerate. Such a course would be a concession to lawless agitation, or rather defiance of all authority, which appears to us utterly irreconcilable with the protracted existence of a National Church. If each National Church has, as our 34th Article declares, authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites ordained only by man's authority, it appears to us that so long as such rites or ceremonies are enjoined, it is necessary that obedience to them should be enforced by the lawful tribunals, and that their wanton violation must be repressed. If such ceremonies are judged to be no longer "done to edifying," they should be changed by lawful authority. Until such change is made, their observance when enforced by authority must be deemed obligatory upon all the ministers of the Church, in virtue of their ordination vows; and the indirect relaxation of such obligation, as a concession to open insubordination and contumacy must, if conceded, be regarded as a virtual surrender of the existing compact between Church

Digitized by Google

and State, a surrender which can hardly be viewed in any other light than as the precursor of its utter dissolution.

Having thus explained the views which we hold on the general subject of the indifference of rites and ceremonies in themselves, and at the same time of the necessity of enforcing obedience to them when enjoined by lawful authority, we must briefly state the grounds on which the enforcement of such obedience appears to us of pre-eminent importance at the present time.

Had the avowed and even vaunted contumacy to which we have referred been based merely upon some incongruity in the Rubrics respecting the rites or ceremonies in question, as interpreted by the supreme Court of Appeal, with the views of the malcontents respecting the most becoming mode of celebrating the Holy Communion, we should have been disposed to regard it, however reprehensible, as comparatively harmless. But the objections actually urged are of a widely different character, and the motives for the adoption of one or both of the obnoxious practices are avowedly based, not upon ceremonial, but upon doctrinal considerations. The eastward position and the Eucharistic vestments are alleged to symbolize, and thus to teach—a method which specially commends itself to the minds of the multitude—the doctrines of a sacrificial priesthood, and of the objective presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated elements. It is this which imparts to the present struggle which is being waged within the English Church its true significance. Regarded in and of themselves, as we have already observed, we should have classed both of the points now so eagerly contended for, if not absolutely amongst the *adiaphora*, at least amongst the *ineptiæ tolerabiles;* and in either case we should have deemed it a vain expenditure of our own labour, and of the time of our readers, to bestow more than a few passing remarks upon matters of such slight and transient interest. When regarded, however, in the light in which they are confessedly regarded by the Ritualists of the present day, these points assume an entirely different aspect; and when we are told by men like Canon Rawlinson,—speaking in the lower House of Convocation,—that the "whole question at stake is in fact that of *the Real Presence*," we cease to wonder that those who, like Canon Swainson, had been previously disposed to plead for liberty, have now seen reason to change their opinion, and have been reluctantly forced to the conviction that instead of making concessions, as they fain would have done, to the convictions or the prejudices of their weaker brethren, they are summoned to fight manfully and unflinchingly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

The question of the vestments, when divested of its purely technical character, may be reduced within very moderate limits.

Digitized by Google

The words of the late learned and lamented Mr. Wharton Marriott, may be regarded as embodying the results of the researches of those most competent to speak with authority respecting the history of vestments in the earliest ages. They are as follows:—"In the apostolic age there was no essential difference between the dress worn by Christians in ordinary life, and that worn by bishops, priests, or other clerics when engaged in offices of holy ministration; but after a lapse of three or four centuries the dress of ordinary life became changed, whilst that worn in Ecclesiastical offices remained in form unchanged, though even more and more richly decorated."[a]

Mr. Marriott proceeds to show that all the best authorities are agreed in the conclusion, that as soon as any particular dress was generally adopted by the Christian ministry the colour of that dress was white; whilst he further arrives at the conclusion, that the most ancient representations of ministerial dress present a remarkable resemblance to the surplice and scarf, or stole, now generally worn in the English Church.

There is the less need for dwelling at any length upon the history of Ecclesiastical vestments, inasmuch as this subject has received more than ordinary attention within the last few years, and has been treated, both popularly and also in elaborate treatises, by many able and learned writers. We may refer, by way of illustration, to the address recently delivered on this subject at Sion College, by the Dean of Westminster, which has appeared in the February number of the *Contemporary Review;* and which elicited, in the March number of the same periodical, a very characteristic reply from the pen of Dr. Littledale. The Dean of Westminster supports the inferences which he draws by evidence adduced by Roman Catholic writers, such as Cardinal Bona, Père Thomassin, and Dr. Rock; and also by writers of our own communion, such as Mr. Marriott, to whose well-known work we have already referred. These inferences Dr. Littledale appears to us to evade rather than to disprove. He is constrained, indeed, to bear witness to the "varied learning and admirable tone" of Mr. Marriott's "erudite work;" but with a singular inconsistency,—which in the judgment of those who are familiar with the work will be deemed wholly incompatible with any accurate acquaintance with its contents,—he observes that "Mr. Marriott would have proved his case if there never had been an Eastern Church." Dr. Littledale attempts, indeed, to show that the Dean of Westminster and Mr. Marriott "differ fundamentally on a cardinal point of the whole controversy,"—the one alleging that there was "absolutely no distinction whatever between

[a] "Vestiarium Christianum." Int., p. ii.

Digitized by Google

clerical and lay attire," whilst the other directed his efforts towards the establishment of the proofs of the use of a special vesture, at a very remote period, for the purposes of religious worship.

We think that here, as in the previous instance, the error lies with Dr. Littledale. The statements of the Dean of Westminster are, as was suited to the occasion, of a more general and less accurately defined character than those of Mr. Marriott; but we are unable to see any inconsistency between them. The Dean insists on the fact, that the dress of the clergy, so far from being in its origin "symbolical, sacerdotal, sacrificial, or mystical," originated simply in the fashions common to the whole community of the Roman empire. Mr. Marriott, whilst maintaining essentially the same position, describes more precisely the character of the dress thus adopted, and shows that in the primitive period of about four hundred years the dress adopted by Christian ministers was "in form, in shape, in distinctive name, identical with the dress worn by persons of condition on occasions of joyous festival, or solemn ceremonial."

Dr. Littledale's feeble attempt to set aside the salient facts of the Dean of Westminster's address may be regarded as an indication of the utter inability of the champions of Ritualism,—for as such Dr. Littledale is commonly esteemed, we believe, amongst his own party,—to establish any solid historical foundation on which to base their arguments in support of distinctive Eucharistic vestments. We think, moreover, that the fact that writers such as Dr. Littledale and Mr. Blunt are permitted to occupy a prominent position amongst the Ritualists is very significant as to the literary and theological attainments of the leading men amongst those who are now distracting the English Church. We presume that statements to the effect that the altar of incense, at which the priests ministered daily, formed a part of the furniture of the holy of holies, into which the high priest alone entered once in the year,[b] and that the mercy-seat was "flanked" either by the cherubim which are supposed to have formed an integral part of that mysterious lid of the Ark, or by

---

[b] We are not unmindful, whilst writing, either of 1 Kings vi. 22 or of Heb. ix. 4, to which latter place Dr. Littledale refers in justification of his statement. The present is not the place to explain the precise import of these passages, or to enter upon the nature of the close connection which existed between the altar of incense and the holy of holies. Our modern Rationalists, of course, find no difficulty in the assumption that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews was capable of a blunder similar to that perpetrated by Dr. Littledale. We may, however, observe, in the words of Delitzch, with reference to such a theory, that even had the writer of that Epistle been an Alexandrian Jew, "*he must have been a monster of ignorance and forgetfulness to be capable of such a mistake.*"

Digitized by Google

the cherubim which in Solomon's Temple covered the whole of the western side of the most holy place, are calculated to excite no misgivings amongst our modern Ritualists as to the theological attainments of their chosen guides. Neither, we presume, are they wont to discover any lack of logical sequence in arguments designed to prove that Christian *Churches* existed in the days of St. Peter, based upon the fact that the early Christians used to meet in rooms, such as the upper chamber in which the Lord's Supper was instituted. Amidst assertions and arguments such as these, we are glad to meet with one portion of his reply to the Dean of Westminster in which, we think, Dr. Littledale is perfectly secure from successful retaliation on the part of his adversaries. It is that in which he describes the learning of the Dean of Westminster's address as of the "Smith's Dictionary level." Now, inasmuch as the name of Dean Stanley is included amongst those of the many able and learned writers who contributed to that valuable work, we do not imagine that the Dean can fairly take exception to this description of his address. We think, however, that had the remarkable discoveries of Dr. Littledale to which we have referred been found in the articles "Ark" and "Cherubim" in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," it is not too much to say that that book would not have attained the position which it now occupies as a standard work of reference for theological students.

The history of the Ornaments Rubric and of the mode of its observance are clearly and succintly stated by Canon Swainson in his "Rubrical Question of 1874," and by Mr. Bardsley in his "Eucharistic Vestments and the Eastward Position," and more fully by Dr. Blakeney, in his "Book of Common Prayer in its History and Interpretation," all of which will abundantly repay a careful perusal.

The history may be briefly stated thus. In the year 1549, the use of the Eucharistic vestments was distinctly enjoined by the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI.; in the year 1552 the same vestments were forbidden by the second Prayer-book of that Sovereign, in the following terms: "And here it is to be noted that the minister, *at the time of the Communion and at all other times of his ministration*, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope: but being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

Pausing only to direct the special attention of our readers to the words which we have printed in italics, we proceed to the Rubric of Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book of 1559. By that Rubric the minister was required to "use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second

Digitized by Google

year of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

The meaning of this direction has been decided by the Final Court of Appeal, to be that the use of the vestments enjoined in the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI., again became obligatory. The Act, however, to which reference is made in the Rubric, contains the following important clause: "Until other orders shall therein be taken by authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the great seal of England for clauses Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this realm."

The question at issue then is whether the "orders" to which reference is made in the Act, were or were not taken by Queen Elizabeth, with the advice of the person or persons specified therein. Our readers are aware that in the judgment of the Supreme Court of Appeal, as expressed in the *Purchas* case, such "orders" are held to have been taken, and consequently that Mr. Purchas "offended against the laws ecclesiastical in wearing a chasuble, alb, and tunicle."

It is not within our province to discuss the purely technical question involved in this decision, which can be determined only by a duly constituted Court, should the case thus decided be again raised. We think, however, that it is a matter of considerable importance that our readers should be put in possession of the materials on which they may arrive at a definite opinion as to the mind of the rulers of the Church, from the days of Queen Elizabeth up to the period when the Ornaments Rubric of 1661 was inserted in our Prayer-book. The facts of the case appear to be as follows. In 1564, the "Advertisements" of Queen Elizabeth appeared, by which it was provided that in the ministration of the holy communion in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister should use a cope, with gospeller and epistler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at that Communion Table, only "surplesses" should be used. It was also provided that in parish churches the minister, both in saying public prayer or in *ministering the Sacraments*, should wear a "comely surpless with sleeves," and that the parish should provide "a decent table, standing on a frame, for the Communion Table." These Advertisements are referred to both by Parker and by Whitgift, as Canon Swainson informs his readers, as of public authority. In the year 1604, the Ornaments Rubric was inserted in the Prayer-book of King James I., in precisely the same terms as those in which it had appeared in the Prayer-book of Queen Elizabeth; and in the same year appeared also the Canons, which are held to be still binding upon the clergy, by which the use is enjoined, not—as we should

Digitized by Google

reasonably have expected, had such been the design of the Rubric,—of the vestments of 1549, but of the dress already required by the Advertisements: viz., the surplice in parish churches for all ministrations, and the cope to be worn in cathedrals on certain days by the chief minister in the celebration of the Holy Communion.

Thus far, then, whether the interpretation assigned by the rulers of the Church to the Ornaments Rubric, was or was not a correct interpretation, it is obvious that that Rubric was not understood by them as bringing back the vestments of King Edward VI's. first Prayer-book; and if our readers are desirous of knowing what was the actual interpretation put upon the law during the early portion of the seventeenth century, it will suffice, amidst a mass of conspiring evidence, to refer them to the Visitation Articles of Laud, both as Bishop of London and as Archbishop of Canterbury, as of one who cannot be suspected of any intentional disparagement of pre-Reformation rites and ceremonies. The 29th of Laud's Visitation Articles for the Diocese of London in the year 1628, is as follows: "Whether there be any in your parish who are known or suspected to conceal or keep hid in their houses any mass-books, portesses, or other books of Popery or superstition; or any *chalices, copes, vestments, albes,* or other ornaments of superstition, uncancelled or undefaced, which is to be conjectured they keep for a day, as they call it."[c] The same inquiry appears as the 33rd of the Visitation Articles for the Peculiars of Canterbury, in the year 1637.[d]

Coming down to the year 1661, we find, as Canon Swainson again reminds us, that in the first address from the ministers to King Charles II. in that year, no allusion was made to the vestments, but only to conscientious scruples about the use of the surplice; to which the King, in his reply, says that he would leave all men at liberty whether they would wear it or not.

Again, in the Savoy Conference, which was held in the same year, although the ministers objected to the Ornaments Rubric as "seeming" to bring back the cope, alb, etc., so little was this objection regarded by the Bishops in the light of a practical difficulty, that the ministers were understood by them to object to the surplice only; and their vindication extended only to this habit as being ancient, and as resembling purity and beauty, by reason of the white linen of which it was composed. Notwithstanding, however, the indisposition of the Bishops at the Savoy Conference to make any alteration in the Ornaments Rubric, we

---

[c] Laud's Works, vol. v., p. 414. Anglo-Catholic Library.

[d] Ibid., p. 448.

Digitized by Google

know that it was altered at the final revision; and when we bear in mind not only the objections made to it in the Savoy Conference, but also the fact that Bishop Cosin, whose attention, as it is well known, had been specially directed to this Rubric, was engaged in that revision, we can scarcely suppose that the alterations made at this time were made without due consideration, or without designed significance. Now these alterations were threefold:—

(1) Whereas in the earlier Rubric a special reference was made to the ornaments used by the minister "at the time of the Communion," as well as "at all other times in his ministration," the reference to the time of Communion was altogether omitted in the Rubric of 1661; and provision was made for the use of certain ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof "*at all times of their ministration.*"

(2) The significant word "retained," which had occurred in the Act of Queen Elizabeth, was inserted.

(3) The reference to "the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book" (*i.e.*, to the Act of Queen Elizabeth) was omitted.

When these changes in the Rubric are viewed in connection with the very significant fact that the "Book of the Liturgy," for which the Committee of the House of Commons appointed June 25th, 1661, to review the several laws for confirming the Liturgy of the Church of England, was to search, was the *second* Prayer-book of King Edward VI.,—a book which unfortunately could not be found,—we think it is hard to resist the three following inferences:—

(1) That the ornaments designed to be *retained* were those already in use, not those which had long fallen into utter desuetude, and which had been generally destroyed.

(2) That the vestment or vestments appointed to be used at the time of the Communion, were designed to be the same as those used at all other times of ministration; and

(3) That the reference to Queen Elizabeth's Act was no longer deemed necessary, inasmuch as the further "orders" therein contemplated were deemed to have been already taken.

The contemporaneous evidence that the use of the surplice, and of the surplice only, was binding upon the parochial clergy, is so overwhelming that we need only refer those of our readers who may desire to prosecute this inquiry further, to the collection of Visitation Articles which is found in the Appendix to the second Report of the Ritual Commissioners, which was printed in 1868. One quotation, and that quotation one which, when we consider (1) Bishop Cosin's own views, (2) the use which appears to have been made by the Convocation of 1662 of his Articles

Digitized by Google

of Inquiry, and (3) the esteem in which his name is professedly held by our modern Ritualists, may be justly described as *instar omnium*, will suffice for our present purpose. The fourth Inquiry, under the title, "Concerning Ministers, Preachers, and Lecturers," of Bishop Cosin's Articles of 1662, is as follows: "Doth he *always*, at the reading or celebrating *any Divine Office* in your church or chappel, *constantly wear the surplice*, and other his ecclesiastical habit according to his degree. And doth he never omit it?"[e]

Those of our readers who are familiar with the importance attached at this period of Church history to strict uniformity in the use of ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies, will have little difficulty in determining whether this inquiry was designed to be understood in accordance with its literal and obvious import, or whether it was designed to be understood, according to the gloss imposed upon it by our modern Ritualists, as prescribing that *minimum* of ceremonial which alone was capable of being enforced, whilst chasubles, albs, and tunicles were being "kept for a day."[f]

We now proceed to the consideration of the second point proposed for discussion in this paper: viz., the position of the minister during the celebration of the Holy Communion. And here we would premise that none can feel more strongly than we do the humiliating spectacle which the English Church presents to the eyes of Christendom at the present moment, convulsed as it is, and it may be about to be rent asunder on a question which, *when regarded in and of itself*, must be universally acknowledged to be one of absolute indifference, provided only that all things be done decently and to edification. Every consideration which is calculated to operate upon men of candid minds and of large sympathies, and to prompt them to advocate the toleration of a diversity of practice in accordance with a diversity of views in different congregations on the subject of Eucharistic Vestments, would dispose them still more strongly towards the adoption of the same course in regard to the position of the minister during the celebration of the Holy Communion. But alas! the question has now assumed a phase which seems to relegate it altogether from the domain of ritual to that of doctrine. The time possibly was, when, upon the grounds still adopted by the Bishop of Lincoln, and by some other strenuous opponents of Romanism, the toleration of a diversity of postures, by the introduction of

[e] Second Report, p. 601.

[f] In confirmation of this statement we may refer our readers to the opinions of Bishop Sanderson, as contained in a very rare volume published in the year 1663, and entitled "Special Remarques of the Life of the renowned Dr. Sanderson, late Lord Bishop of Lincoln." Pp. 36, 47.

Digitized by Google

an explanatory Rubric, might have been permitted without even the seeming toleration of a diversity of doctrine on the great questions of the objective presence in the elements and of the sacrificial powers of the priesthood. We would fain hope, if the decision of the Judicial Committee of Council in the Purchas case should hereafter be reversed, that such toleration might even then be found altogether compatible with the firm maintenance of that doctrine of the Eucharist, which we believe to be alone consistent with the language of Scripture and the teaching of the English Church. But whatever might be the result of the toleration of any deviation from the established practice of the English Church, should such deviation be declared to be compatible with the existing law, we entertain the utmost apprehension of the introduction of any change in that law with a view to the toleration of such a deviation. The question now at stake, as some of the Ritualists have been honest enough to declare in plain and unambiguous terms, is no longer that of ritual, but of doctrine. It is no longer the question whether the eastward position is, as its advocates of old times regarded it, more convenient when viewed in its physical, or more becoming when viewed in its devotional aspect. The question is, as it has been well stated by Canon Selwyn in his letter to the three Deans, whether the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated, as the Catechism of the Church of England teaches, "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ," and as a communion of His body and blood; or, whether the consecrating minister performs a sacrificial act, and by it is signified and expressed "the solemn oblation and sacrificial presentation made by the celebrant, after the example of Christ."

Such being the real issue at stake in the present controversy, we deem it desirable, notwithstanding all that has been already advanced in the columns of the *Christian Observer* on this subject, to lay before our readers, in as precise and succinct a form as may be, the past history and the present aspect of the eastward position controversy. It is well known that the position of the priest at the beginning of the Communion Office, according to the requirements of King Edward VI's. first Prayer-book was, "afore the middes of the altar," and that the Prayer of Consecration was appointed to be said by the priest "turning him to the altar:" that altar being the old pre-reformation altar, and occupying its ancient position. In the year 1550, by the command of King Edward VI., altars were abolished, and Communion Tables of no prescribed form,—commonly, no doubt, oblong, but in some cases *square*,—were commanded to be set up in their place, "in some convenient part of the chancel." In the year 1552 the second Prayer-book of King Edward VI.

Digitized by Google

appeared, by which it was appointed that the Tables thus substituted in the place of altars should stand, not where the old altars stood, nor even, of necessity, in the chancel at all, but "in the body of the churche, or in the chauncell, where morning prayer and eveninge prayer be appointed to be sayde." The importance of this direction,—a direction, which, notwithstanding all efforts to effect an alteration in it, has remained substantially unchanged up to the present day,—cannot be over-estimated on the part of all who desire to form a just and impartial judgment of the merits of the eastward position controversy. The Table, we repeat, according to the existing law, and according to the law which has been in operation for upwards of 300 years, may be of any shape, and actually has been, and we believe in some cases still is, square. That Table not only may be, in all cases in which morning and evening prayer are said in the chancel, placed, at the Communion time, *in a convenient place* in the chancel, but was actually required to be so placed at *that time* by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, and afterwards removed to the place "where it stood before;" and although the Canons of 1604,—Canons which are still binding upon the clergy whenever enforced by the Ordinary, not being inconsistent with statute law,—are not quite so full and explicit as the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth as to the change of place from time to time, nevertheless both the English Canons and also the Latin Canons (which are of equal authority with the English) admit of no other interpretation than that which brings them into entire accordance with the Injunctions, in regard to the change of position of the table at the time of Communion.[g] And yet further, in all cases in which morning and evening prayer are appointed to be said in the body of the church, the proper place of the Communion Table, according to the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer during the last 300 years, has also been in *the body of the church*, in preference to any part of the chancel: the priority of place, it should be observed, being given to the body of the church over the chancel by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, from 1552 down to 1661; and also, as we shall have occasion to see, in the face of a distinct proposal to restrict the position of the table to the upper end of the chancel by the corresponding Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, as finally settled at the last revision. Now it must be remembered

[g] The words of the Latin Canon are as follows: "Suoque certo loco consistant (*i.e.*, mensæ) *nisi cum Sacramentum* erit administrandum." Mr. Hope complains of the obscurity both of the English and the Latin Canon in this place (p. 189.) He admits, however, that the directions concerning the position of the Table are, to adopt his own language, more *puritanical* than those of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions.

Digitized by Google

that it is allowed by common consent, that in those cases in which the table is oblong, the table-wise position, as opposed to the altar-wise position, is the concomitant of the change of position of the Table from the place in which the old altars stood, either to the lower part of the chancel, or to the body of the church.

It follows from what has been now advanced, that whatever interpretation may be assigned to the words "standing before the Table,"—that Table being oblong, and being placed altar-wise,—nothing more is needed than a return to a custom which is in entire consistency with the plain and obvious meaning of the Rubric of the existing Prayer-book, and which appears to be expressly contemplated by the Canon of 1604, in order to remove every particle of ambiguity from the much vexed Rubric which precedes the Prayer of Consecration, and to fix the position of the officiating minister, whenever the obvious requirements of the service do not remove him from it, at the literal north side of the Table.

It is urged, however, on the other side, that as the result of the efforts of Laud, of Wren, of Pierce and others, the altar-wise position of the Tables had been very extensively adopted previously to the great troubles of the 17th century; and it is commonly assumed that one of the immediate results of the Restoration was the general adoption of that position throughout the country; and consequently that the Rubric of 1662 must be interpreted in harmony with the prevailing oblong form, and with the assumed altar-wise position of the Tables.

Now we think that it will be universally admitted that in the interpretation of statute law, the first consideration should be that any one portion of that law should be so interpreted as to be in harmony with all other portions; and that custom, however general, should only be admitted as an aid to the interpretation of the law, when there is a manifest or apparent inconsistency in the several portions of the law itself. We submit, then, that in the present instance the whole of the ambiguity has arisen from the assumption of the existence of a custom in 1661, which did not exist in 1552. And inasmuch as we regard the position of the Table as the true key to the solution of the controversy now at issue, it becomes a matter of considerable importance that we should endeavour to ascertain,—first, the history of the Rubric which determines that position; and secondly, the extent —as far as it may be ascertained—of the custom introduced by Laud, of placing the Table altar-wise and railing it in, with a view, probably, not only to prevent its desecration, but also to discountenance its change of position during the time of administration; and thirdly, the amount of reasonable presumption which

Digitized by Google

exists in favour of the supposition that the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration was framed with a view to its adaptation to the immoveable and altar-wise position of the Table.

It has already been observed, that the Rubric introduced into King Edward's Prayer-book of 1552, respecting the position of the Table at the time of the Holy Communion, has remained substantially unchanged up to the present time. This statement, however, though strictly accurate, conveys but a very inadequate impression of the strength of the evidence which the history of this Rubric affords against the legality of the eastward position; inasmuch as it is quite *possible* that any Rubric might have remained unchanged through inadvertence, or that any slight changes which it underwent might have been effected at a time when no diversity of opinion was known to exist upon the questions,—whether Ritual or doctrinal,—which were, or which were supposed to be, at issue.

Now such does not appear to have been the case in regard to the Rubric under consideration. We have already seen what was the practice which was expressly enjoined by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, within a few months after the reproduction of the Rubric of 1552 in the Prayer-book of 1559, and also by the Canons of 1604, which were almost contemporaneous with the appearance of King James' Prayer-book of the same year. We have, therefore, in both these cases plain and unequivocal proof how the Rubric determining the position of the Table was understood at those respective periods. During that unsettled period which immediately preceded the great Rebellion, strenuous efforts were made—as is well known—by Laud and by some others, to enforce the altar-wise position of the Table at the upper end of the chancel *at all times*, whether during or out of the time of administration. These efforts, seconded as they were by the arbitrary and illegal exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, were to a considerable extent successful; insomuch, indeed, as Canon Swainson has remarked, that in the Diocese of Bath and Wells the altar-wise position of the Table was established in 140 churches out of 469.

The innovation thus introduced was but of short duration. In very many churches during the Commonwealth the Holy Communion appears to have been rarely, if ever administered; and it is superfluous to observe how little probability there is of the continued observance at this period of any custom which, however ignorantly identified with Popery, was yet generally regarded in that light. It is impossible to produce a more unexceptionable witness to the interpretation commonly assigned by Churchmen to the Rubric under consideration, up to the time of the restoration, than the learned author of the "Alliance of

Digitized by Google

Divine Offices," who, writing in the year 1659, explains at considerable length the position of the Table in and out of Communion time, as enjoined by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth and by the Canons of 1604; to both of which he appeals by way of illustrating the meaning of the Rubric, which he observes was "not explicit enough as to the proper station of the Holy Table." Having appealed to both of these authorities as enjoining the removal of the Table at the time of administration, and to the Injunctions as directing its position altar-wise "out of communion time," L'Estrange first remarks,—in reference to that portion of the Injunctions,—that "they who can find Popery in that position have better eyes than ordinary;" and then, with reference to the direction that the priest should stand at the north side of the Table, he remarks further, "This seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest's standing with his face towards the east, *as is the Popish practice.*"

Our space will not permit us to do more than make passing allusion to the evidence adduced by Canons Robertson[h] and Swainson of the continued existence of the tablewise position during the latter portion of the seventeenth century. It would suffice, by way of illustration, to refer to Dr. Barnard's pathetic description of the "mischief" which arose out of the publication of Bishop Williams's book, entitled "The Holy Table:" viz., that "*in most country churches to this day* (1683, A.D.) *the table is set at the hither end of the chancel, without any traverse or rails to fence it.*" It so happens, however, that in the following year, Richard Baxter, than whom few better informed witnesses could be adduced, put forth his treatise entitled, "Catholic Communion defended against both extremes." In this treatise whilst pointing out the anomalies involved in the Canons of 1604, he observes that under Canon xii. "all that, without the King's authority, agree to turn the table altar-wise, etc., are now excommunicate by an authority above the Bishops."[i]

But it appears to us that independently of all historical evidence the facts of the case speak for themselves. At the time at which the final revision of the Book of Common Prayer was

---

[h] "How Shall we Conform to the Liturgy?" Second edition. 1844. Pp. 152—162.

[i] P. 46. We may direct the attention of our readers, by way of illustration, to the copy of a copper-plate in a small book, published in 1674, and entitled, "A Course of Catechising," etc., which has been published in the March number of "*The Church Association Monthly Intelligencer.*" In this engraving the Lord's Table is placed in the chancel table-wise, and the communicants are represented kneeling, some at the Table and some at a little distance from it. The following question and answer are found in p. 300: "Why doth the priest stand on the north side of the table? A.—To avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the East."

Digitized by Google

made, the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth and the Canons of 1604, were the generally recognised standards of the law of the Church of England. A very large proportion of the actual holders of benefices were men who had either not received Episcopal ordination, or, having been episcopally ordained, had conformed to the order of the Directory.

The 2000 who were ejected on St. Bartholomew's Day,—no inconsiderable proportion of the entire body of the clergy of 1661,—formed only a portion of those who, although, like Reynolds, they submitted to the provisions of the Act of Uniformity, were strongly opposed to Laud's innovations, and whose sympathies were, to a greater or less degree, with the "ministers" rather than with the Episcopalian divines in the Savoy Conference.

We think, then, that independently of any direct historial evidence as to the circumstances under which the Rubric prescribing the position of the holy table during the time of communion was adopted at the last revision, we may fairly assume that there is so much antecedent probability in favour of the Bishop of Lincoln's assertion that the long-wise or table-wise position was that which prevailed at that time,[1] that we may fairly assume, in the absence of opposing evidence, that it was that position which was primarily, if not exclusively, contemplated in the Rubric preceding the Consecration prayer, in which the priest is directed to stand "before the Table."

Recent discovery, however, has removed all reasonable doubt as to the fact that that position was directly present, if not to the minds of the ecclesiastical revisers of 1661, at least to the minds of those who were responsible for the final emendations and corrections of the Book of Common Prayer; in other words that the table-wise position was distinctly recognised by the legislature which framed and imposed the Act of Uniformity. As this is a point of cardinal importance in the right interpretation of the Rubric which precedes the Prayer of Consecration, in other words, in the determination of the true meaning of the words "before the Table," we shall offer no apology to our readers for adducing the evidence somewhat at length.

It is not generally known, and possibly it may not have been deemed expedient by all who are acquainted with the fact to make allusion to it, that the Book of Common Prayer to which it was originally designed by the House of Commons that the Act of Uniformity should apply, was not the Book of King James I. (*i.e.*, the Book of Common Prayer, according to its most

[1] "Plea for Toleration," p. 5.

Digitized by Google

recent revision[k]), but the second Book of King Edward VI., the Book[l] in which, as is well known, the principles of the Reformation generally were advanced to a higher point than at any subsequent period in the history of the National Church, and, more particularly, so far as regards rites and ceremonies. It was not until,—after some delay,—all attempts to procure a copy of this work had failed, that the Commons were content to have recourse to the Prayer-book of James I., which was selected, as Mr. Cardwell is of opinion, for the purpose of avoiding the *alleged* alterations introduced into the Prayer-book by Archbishop Laud.[m]

But whilst the Bill to which the book of 1604 was attached was slumbering in the House of Lords, the Houses of Convocation had met, and, as the result of their deliberations, certain additions and alterations were made to a copy of the Prayer-book bearing date 1636, which book was accepted by the King in Council, and recommended to the Houses of Parliament as the book to which the intended Act of Uniformity was to apply. A fair copy of this book was made, and appended to the Act of Uniformity, which copy has been very recently recovered, and is now deposited, together with the Act of Uniformity, in the Victoria Tower, Westminster.

Undoubted evidence has been adduced that certain alterations were made in this book during its passage through the House of Lords, the House of Commons having affirmed by a vote their power to make alterations in it, but having declined to exercise that power. It is a matter of *comparatively* little moment, as regards our present argument, whether the alteration to which we are about to refer was or was not one of these alterations.[n] Certain it is that in the fair copy which was prepared and submitted to the King and the Houses of Parliament, and also in the margin of the printed book of 1636, from which the manuscript copy was made, there are several places in which erasures and alterations occur, and, in the judgment of Mr. Perry, these alterations are made, not in the handwriting of the original scribe, but in that of another person.

---

[k] It is not unworthy of observation that this revision of the Book of Common Prayer appears to have received the sanction neither of Parliament nor of the clergy in Convocation. See Cardwell's "History of the Conferences," p. 143.

[l] See documents relating to the Act of Uniformity, 1862. P. 408.

[m] Ibid, p. 376. It is right to observe that Mr. Cardwell *surmises* that this Prayer-book of King Edward VI. may have been found, and on examination, not approved. He adduces, however, no evidence whatever for this surmise.

[n] It is the decided opinion of Canon Swainson, who has examined this point with great care, that this is one of the alterations which was made by the House of Lords.

Digitized by Google

Now amongst these alterations there is one in the Rubric which prescribes the position of the Table. That Rubric, Canon Swainson informs us, stood originally in the fair copy of the manuscript Prayer-book as follows:—"The Table, at the Communion time, having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the most convenient place in the upper end of the chancel (or of the body of the Church when there is no chancel)."[o]

It appears then that so far from this point being overlooked at the last revision, there was an effort, and apparently a successful effort, made in the Houses of Convocation to secure the permanent position of the Table at the upper end of the chancel,—a position which has always been held to be the concomitant of the altar-wise position. This attempt was baffled at the last moment, and not only was the old Rubric of 1552 substantially reproduced, or rather retained, but by the transposition of the word "having" from its old place after "the Table," to its present place after "time," the Rubric, whether designedly or undesignedly, has been brought into closer accordance with the canon of 1604, and, leaving its position *out of Communion time* undetermined, it positively decides that *during Communion time* it is to stand in the place where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said, whether that place be the chancel or the body of the church. It would be mere waste of time to argue, in this case, the meaning of the words "before the Table," when, by evidence which to all impartial readers must appear conclusive, the lawfulness, if not the obligation, of the removal of the Table during the Communion time, either to the lower end of the chancel or into the body of the church, has been established; *the table-wise position*, it must be remembered, being confessedly the concomitant of the removal of the Table.

It is no part of our present design to determine whether it was, or was not the intention of those who insisted on this alteration to insist also on the table-wise position, or whether they deemed the spirit, if not the letter, of the Rubric complied with by the position of the priest at the north end of the Table, the Table being in that case before him, and he being, in a fairly *admissible* sense of the words, "before the Table." Our point is this. The removal of the Table being in all cases lawful, and in some cases absolutely prescribed, the meaning of the words "before the Table" must be determined by reference to the

[o] See also the fourth Report of the Ritual Commissioners (p. 17), where, however, the word "most" does not occur. There is, however, apparently some clerical error either in the original MS. or in the copy. This point, however, is perfectly immaterial to the present argument, and therefore the writer has not thought it worth while to ascertain wherein the error consists.

Digitized by Google

ordinary—we believe the invariable—position of the Table when so *removed;* not by reference to the position of an immoveable altar, the existence of which is not recognised in the Book of Common Prayer.

Those who are content with the ritual which satisfied the great body of English Churchmen from 1552 down to 1830 may well adopt as their motto *quieta non movere.* But if changes and innovations are inevitable,—if it is to be determined when the Table is oblong, not square, that the word "side" can only mean the broad side, and that to stand "before the Table" can only mean to stand at that broad side,—then we urge that the law should be interpreted as a consistent whole, and that in conformity alike with the Rubric and with the Canons, the Table should be moved *at the Communion time* either to the lower end of the chancel or into the body of the church, and that the priest should stand at its *literal north side,* and there break the bread "before the people" and perform all other parts of the service, "but when (to adopt the words of Cosin in 1627) he hath special cause to remove from it."

We have already occupied so large a portion of our available space that we are unable to do more than notice in a most cursory manner many of the points which have been discussed by Mr. Hope, and some of which are also considered in one or more of the other books and pamphlets which stand at the head of the present article.

Had our space allowed, we should have thought it desirable to direct the attention of our readers to several of the numerous inaccuracies and to the arbitrary assumptions which we have detected in the statements both of Mr. Hope and of Mr. Morton Shaw. A few instances, however, will suffice to put our readers on their guard against hastily accepting statements, which, however honestly put forward on the part of these writers, need to be received with much caution by those who have recourse to them as authorities in historical matters.

(1) Mr. Hope assumes that Andrews (p. 201), Laud, and Cosin (p. 194) adopted the eastward position, and Mr. Shaw (p. 49) speaks of "the admitted practice of Bishops Wren and Cosin." As regards the practice of Bishop Andrews Mr. Hope adduces no evidence whatever. We presume, however, that he refers to the Consecration Service of that prelate. Had Mr. Hope examined that Service carefully, he would have found that the chaplain who begins the Communion office stands *ad Septentrionalem partem sacræ Mensæ,—i.e.* at the north part of the Holy Table; and that the Bishop who reads the Post Communion Service kneels *ad Sacræ Mensæ Septentrionem.* As regards the Prayer of Consecration, the direction has reference solely to the

Digitized by Google

standing position, *stans ait.* The kneeling stools in the plate of Bishop Andrews's Chapel, in the Book entitled "Canterbury's Doome" (p. 122), bear witness only to the adoption of the two positions at the north end and the south end of the Table. Mr. Hope's inference that the Consecration Prayer was said at the centre of the Table, grounded on the position of the cushion for the Service Book and "the exceptional use of the cross" in the exact centre of the Holy Table, is somewhat singular. Bishop Wren's inability to reach the elements from the north end must have arisen, we presume, out of the interposition of some obstacle between himself and the elements, which was, in all probability, a cushion for the Service Book; whilst, as regards the cross in the centre, Mr. Hope's suggestion appears to rest upon nothing more than mere surmise. It is somewhat remarkable, as showing what different inferences may be drawn from the same facts, that the Bishop of Lincoln appeals to the cushion for the celebrant at the north end of the Table in support of precisely the opposite conclusion to that which has been drawn by Mr. Hope.[p]

As regards Archbishop Laud, it is well known that the charges adduced against him in this respect had reference to the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration in the Scotch Prayer-book of 1637; that in his defence he admits that the eastward position is "without warrant of the Book of England," and that he solemnly protested "in the presence of Almighty God" that his sole consideration in that Rubric was a regard to the physical convenience of the officiating minister. It may be added that the sketch of the arrangements of Bishop Andrews's Chapel is given by Prynne in illustration of a list of consecrated plate, etc., in the Chapel of Archbishop Laud, in the book to which we have already referred, and consequently that in the case of Laud, as well as of Andrews, it bears witness to the adoption of the north end position.

In regard to Cosin, who is spoken of by Mr. Shaw as "*Bishop* Cosin" some thirty or forty years before his Consecration (p. 48), notwithstanding the confident assertions both of Mr. Hope and Mr. Shaw, no other proof is adduced by the former of the adoption of the eastward position than the unproved charges alleged against Cosin in 1641 by Peter Smart; whilst Mr. Shaw prefers to content himself with the simple assertion that Cosin's adoption of the practice is admitted. It so happens, however, that we are able to supply our readers with positive evidence derived from an unexceptionable source,—viz., from Cosin's own

[p] See "A Plea for Toleration," by Laud, p. 6.

Digitized by Google

defence, as to the practice adopted by him at the period to which Smart's accusation has reference.

In answer to the accusation of Peter Smart that Cosin "used to officiate at the west side thereof, turning his back to the people," Cosin "*denied that he did ever officiate with face purposely towards the east.*" He then goes on to declare that "he constantly stood at the *north side or end* of the Table to read and perform all parts of the Communion service there. It is quite true, indeed, that Cosin makes some exception to this otherwise invariable rule. But, if ever the exception proved the rule, it surely was so in this case. For whilst Cosin admits that he might, as others before him had done, have stepped to the "former part" of the Table to consecrate and bless those elements which had been placed at the centre of the Table, "about seven foot in length," and which he could not otherwise "conveniently reach," he expressly declares (1) that he "does not remember to have so done these twelve years;" and (2) that when he did so, many of the communicants were kneeling "*very near to the Table, within the rails, on either hand of the defendant,* whose back was not then towards more of the people than it would have been if he had, for that small space of time, stood still at the north side of the Table." (See "Acts of the High Commission Court within the Diocese of Durham, 1858," p. 218. Printed for the Surtees Society.) It appears then that Cosin, whilst acknowledging a slight occasional deviation from the precise *letter* of the Rubric, strictly complied with its spirit, and broke the bread "before:" *i.e.*, so that he could be seen of "the people."

(2) As regards the practices of Bishop Wren, Mr. Hope appeals to the recently edited account of the Abbey Dore Consecration as affording unquestionable evidence (p. 195). We believe we have already sufficiently disposed of this question. We will only add that some further proof is needed of Bishop Wren's responsibility for the irregular practices related in the account of that Consecration, than the simple fact that the Church of Abbey Dore was consecrated by Bishop Field, acting under a commission from Bishop Wren. With regard to the adoption of the eastward position during the Consecration Prayer, Bishop Wren's apology for his confessed irregularity, based as it is upon a necessity which needs no law, is sufficiently well known to all who have considered the historical evidence which has been adduced in favour of that practice.

(3) With regard to the authorship of the Rubric prefixed to the Consecration Prayer, the accounts given by Mr. Hope and Mr. Shaw afford one of the most singular episodes in the historical annals of this controversy.

We have already directed the attention of our readers to a

Digitized by Google

portion of the history of this Rubric. As a question of historical accuracy, we believe, as we have already observed, that there is no evidence that Bishop Cosin was its undoubted framer. So far, however, as concerns our present object, we are more than willing to concede to Mr. Hope and Mr. Shaw the benefit which the assumption may afford to the theory which they have espoused. The point to which we desire to direct attention is the unimportance attached by Bishop Cosin to the words, "before the Table," on which so much in the present controversy has been made to depend. Mr. Hope's account of the position of these words in Bishop Cosin's original draft, is that they happen *to head the whole note*, being introduced over a caret above the beginning, "When the priest;" on which remark we will only observe that it is a somewhat remarkable description of any omission thus supplied, whether casual or intentional, that they "head the whole note."[q]

According to Mr. Shaw's view of the purport of this Rubric, it was "meant by Bishop Cosin, the undoubted framer of it, not only to permit but even to suggest (to those at least who could read the suggestion) that the Prayer of Consecration should be said by the priest 'standing before the Table,' and 'having his back turned towards the people'" (p. 51); and again, in a note at the foot of the following page, Mr. Shaw expresses his opinion that "the existing form of the Rubric, which was no doubt Bishop Cosin's, was adopted, partly because it did not so clearly and unequivocally *order* the front position for saying the Prayer of Consecration."

We shall not now discuss the question of the "great care and forethought in the anticipation of better days," with which, in Mr. Morton's opinion, the Rubric, thus ambiguously worded, was framed. Unfortunately for the whole fabric which Mr. Hope and Mr. Morton have endeavoured to erect on this precarious basis, the original draft of Bishop Cosin's Rubric shows that so far from the words, "before the Table," occupying the prominent place in it which has been thus assigned to them, they formed no part of the Rubric as first devised, and they appear to have been subsequently inserted in an accidental manner. Canon Selwyn has reproduced in his valuable little pamphlet, to which we have already had occasion to refer, a facsimile copy of the original draft of Bishop Cosin's Rubric. It is as follows:—

---

[q] Mr. Hope's idea that Cosin's original intention was "to draw a Rubric like the Scotch," appears to us to be the creation of his own imagination. We are not aware of any direct proof that Cosin's observations were made after 1637. They are found at the end of the interleaved Prayer-book of 1619, and there appears to be no further internal evidence of their date than that they were made in the reign of Charles I.

Digitized by Google

"When the priest hath so ordered the bread and wine ~~placed upon the Table~~ standing before the Table as, that he may with the more readiness ease and decency take the ~~break the bread before the people, and~~ cup into his hands; ~~standing up~~, he shall say as followeth."

These alterations speak for themselves. The Rubric was complete without any reference to the position of the priest in respect to the Table. It directs him to make such preparations before he begins the Prayer of Consecration, as shall enable him "with ease and decency" to perform the manual actions directed at the last review; and it directs him to say the Prayer of Consecration *standing*, and not kneeling. The words "before the Table" were evidently, so to speak, an after-thought. The Rubric was complete without them; and if we are not greatly mistaken, they simply direct that instead of looking away from the Table, the priest is to stand before it:[r] *i.e.*, to have the Table before him; the question of the eastward or the southward position being, so far as concerns the design of the Rubric, either entirely overlooked, or being simply alluded to as already determined by the Rubric at the beginning of the service, directing the priest to stand "at the north side of the Table."[s]

(4) The allusions both of Mr. Hope and of Mr. Shaw to the customs of the Non-jurors are somewhat remarkable. When it is remembered that these High Churchmen (and we suppose that neither Mr. Hope nor Mr. Shaw will dispute their claim to this designation) not only adopted the north-end position in their Liturgy of 1718, but took special pains to make it understood that by "turning to the altar," or "standing or kneeling before it," was always meant that the priest was to stand or kneel "on the north side thereof," and, further, "that "*the north side means the north end*," we are by no means surprised that Mr. Hope should have come to the conclusion that any reference to the opinions and practices of the Non-jurors would not promote the cause which he had in hand. (p. 234.) Mr. Morton Shaw,

---

[r] In Bishop Andrews's Consecration Service the Bishop returns to the Table, and having washed his hands *and broken the bread*, and poured the wine into the cup and mixed it with water, he says the Prayer of Consecration "standing," *stans ait.*

[s] How unsafe all inferences as to the precise position denoted by the words "before the Table" must be, will clearly appear from the fact that in Bishop Andrews's Consecration Service the chaplain who reads the Epistle is directed to stand "before the Holy Table," *ante sacram mensam*, from which direction we presume that neither Mr. Hope nor Mr. Shaw would infer that he was to adopt the *eastward position.*

Digitized by Google

however, with more valour than discretion, it may be thought, has been bold to appeal to the Liturgy of the Non-jurors in support of the main argument of his pamphlet. He asserts (p. 144) that "a very influential section of them, after a while, gave up the use of the Prayer-book of 1662 altogether, and went straight back to the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., which, in 1717, they had reprinted, with some slight alterations, expressly for their use in public worship." In support of this precise and definite assertion, Mr. Shaw adduces no evidence whatever; nor have we been able to discover any other authority for the statement than the fact that the *Communion Office* of the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI. was reprinted for I. Morphew in the year 1717. On turning, however, to Lathbury's "History of the Non-jurors" (p. 277), we find the following reference to this subject: "In the year 1717 appeared the reasons for restoring some prayers, etc. The work was published by Morphew, who was the printer of "The Communion Office," from which circumstance we may infer the probability that Collier, or one of the Non-jurors, was the originator of the latter." Mr. Shaw may have some further evidence to adduce in support of his assertion than that to which we have referred; but in any case the fact that a certain section of the Non-jurors may have thought fit to revert to the Communion Office of King Edward VI., in 1717, will go but very little way towards rebutting the direct evidence, that in 1718 the authorized Liturgy of that body of High Churchmen bore direct and explicit evidence to the interpretation then assigned to the words "before" or "towards" the "altar," etc., and as it is equally unreasonable to doubt, to the prevailing custom of standing at the north end of the Table throughout the whole of the Communion Office.[t] Mr. Shaw's attempt to weaken the force of this evidence by the assertion that the explanatory Rubric to which we have referred, did not appear in Brett's Liturgies in 1720, can only be explained on the supposition that he has obtained his information at second hand, and has not taken the trouble to examine the work himself. Had he done so, he could not have failed to observe that, so far from its being Dr. Brett's design to reprint the whole of the Non-jurors' Liturgy of 1718, he omits the whole of the introductory portion of the Communion Office as well as *all* the introductory Rubrics, and that, in like manner, he omits the concluding portion and the concluding Rubrics. Dr. Brett, as a reference to his book will at once disclose, had a specific object

[t] The fact that the Communion Office of the Non-jurors was taken "partly from primitive liturgies" and "partly from the first English Reformed Common Prayer-book," greatly strengthens the inference which we have drawn from the remarkable Rubric enforcing the north-end position.

Digitized by Google

in view in the reprint of a certain portion of the Communion Office, and he contented himself with the accomplishment of that object.

Our duty to our readers, as reviewers, has constrained us to allude to a few of the many flaws in the evidence adduced by Mr. Hope and by Mr. Morton Shaw, in the course of their observations on the history of the "north side" controversy. We hold ourselves equally bound to award them their due meed of commendation for the candour with which they have expressed their conviction, that the Rubrics of our present Communion office are incapable of reconciliation on the theory which they have undertaken to defend, and that those Rubrics can only be satisfactorily reconciled by a return to the law and practice of the Church regarding the removal of the Table during the time of Communion, and its position either in the chancel or in the body of the church, with its ends east and west, not north and south.

Mr. Morton Shaw expresses himself on this point in the following terms.—Having first avowed his belief that so long as the Holy Table is placed where it is, there is really no north side of it, and therefore that "standing at the north side" is "*a simple impossibility*," he proceeds thus:—"I must not, however, conceal my opinion that if the old Puritan arrangement of the Table were now in operation, *the whole of the Rubrics would be at once brought into perfect harmony*." (p. 68.) To the same effect, though not expressed in equally decisive terms, is the judgment of Mr. Beresford Hope, when he says, in reference to the Rubric which precedes the Prayer of Consecration,—that "*if the Table is to stand altar-wise*, the other Rubrics can *with difficulty be reconciled with it*." (p. 204.)

It is no part of our concern to vindicate the consistency of Mr. Hope or of Mr. Shaw, neither do we deem it needful to animadvert upon the anachronism involved in the words, "The old Puritan arrangement," as applied to the postion of the Communion Table, with its ends east and west instead of north and south. Our object is simply to show that in the judgment of two advocates of the altar-wise position of the Table and of the eastward position of the priest,—both of whom have approached this subject with a larger measure both of knowledge and of judgment than belong to the majority of the writers on the same side,—the cause which they have undertaken to defend is, in fact, indefensible; and that in the words which we have printed in italics they have virtually surrendered the stronghold, which they have endeavoured to guard, into the hands of the enemy. We commend this candid confession to the careful consideration alike of the advocates and of the opponents of the north-side position.

Digitized by Google

In conclusion, we desire to direct the special attention of our readers to the pamphlet of Mr. Bardsley, to the Letters of the Bishop of St. Andrews, of the Dean of Chester, and of Professor Selwyn; and also to the anonymous "Notes concerning the Position of the Minister, etc.," published at Northampton.

BABYLONE ET LA CHALDÉE.

Babylone et la Chaldée Par M. Joachim Ménant. 1 *vol.* 8*vo.* *Paris: Maisonneuve and Co.*

THE volume we purpose introducing to our readers in the present article may be considered as the sequel to the one noticed in the *Christian Observer* some months ago, on the early Kings of Assyria; it is compiled on exactly the same plan, and is distinguished by the same qualities of sound learning and careful discussion: it does the greatest honour to M. Joachim Ménant.

Our author acknowledges, in the first place, that the numerous discoveries which have been made during the last few years in the field of Oriental lore, have unavoidably tended to throw much suspicion upon the facts preserved by classical Greek writers, with reference to the civilization and annals of Persia, Assyria and Babylonia. Hitherto the whole amount of information we possessed on those countries was derived from Herodotus, Xenophon, Strabo, etc.; and the facts thus elicited had been transmitted to us, discussed and expanded in the prosy compilations of Rollin and his successors. In proportion, however, as the wonderful results of the explorations undertaken by Messrs. Layard, Botta, and Place became known,—in proportion as the labours of Dr. Hincks, Professor Rawlinson, M. Jules Oppert and others unravelled for our benefit the mysteries of the cuneiform alphabet, a tendency arose to set unceremoniously aside the old authorities from which we derived our previous knowledge, and to consider them as absolutely worthless. M. Ménant protests against this reaction; talking of the data supplied by Greek history, he says: "Il ne faut pas les rejeter, il faut les contrôler."

The task of putting in methodical order the annals of Assyria was, of course, a difficult one: the history of Chaldæa and Babylon presents stumbling blocks of a more serious nature still; because, instead of having to deal with a lengthened narrative generally characterized by a certain amount of descriptive pretensions, the archæologist finds himself, in the present instance,

Digitized by Google

face to face with merely architectural literature, if we may use such a term; dates are usually absent, and nothing can be done except merely registering the names of Kings, which appear recorded on the inscriptions with a laconism almost analogous to that of numismatic specimens.

The monuments of Chaldæa must have been, like those of Persia, originally decorated with bas-reliefs and explanatory texts. Greek historians allude to them, and the Bible tells us with what feelings of pride Nebuchadnezzar contemplated the splendid sculptures of his palace. Neither inscriptions, however, nor bas-reliefs of any importance have, as yet, been discovered, as in the case of Assyrian remains; and M. Ménant conjectures that the reason for this may be ascribed to the nature of the soil, which, being exclusively clay, is only fit for the manufacture of bricks. Marble and stone were brought to Babylon from a distance, and as they attracted, first of all, the gaze of the populations who settled down in the valley of the lower Euphrates, they were soon employed for the purpose of building other edifices which, in turn, have long since disappeared. It may, at the same time, be anticipated that ulterior researches will bring to light cylinders, engraved bricks and other specimens of ceramic industry similar to those which have helped so powerfully to elucidate the early origin of Assyrian history. Meanwhile, M. Ménant has made admirable use of the documents at his disposal, and he has classified them in six groups, corresponding to as many periods in the history of Chaldæa.

The first of these epochs includes the legendary traditions handed down to us on the early ages of the world and on Chaldæan origins. In this portion of his work M. Ménant brings together the account of the flood as we find it recorded in the Book of Genesis, Berosus, and the writer of the celebrated Chaldæan text lately discovered and translated by Mr. George Smith. These documents read in a parallel manner, and compared one with another, are most interesting, and it is curious to see how the Biblical evidence which represents the flood as a chastisement for the sins of mankind, is confirmed by the other narratives now placed at our disposal. The Tower of Babel and the subsequent dispersions, Nimrod, Zoroaster, Semiramis, are the principal facts and names connected with this epoch, respecting which we are reduced to mere conjectures, and which, therefore, need not detain us.

We come now to history, properly so called; M. Ménant's second epoch embraces details on the state of Chaldæa previous to its occupation by the tribes which, at a later period, gave to it all its glory. We find it difficult, however, to determine between the Assyrians and the Chaldæans the priority of con-

Digitized by Google

quest, and whether originally the former were under the sway of the latter, or the reverse.

A third stage in this panorama is marked by the establishment of what may be called the first Chaldæan Empire; its earliest date is probably 3000, B.C.; it closes with the end of the twelfth century. No certain succession can, as yet, be assigned to the Monarchs who ruled over the Empire; the list, let us add, would include the forty-nine Chaldæan kings, and the eight Arabic ones mentioned by the compilers of Berosus. It must be further remembered that several dynasties appear to have ruled simultaneously, each of which occupied a geographical centre in the valley of the Euphrates; and the union of these different groups of populations under one and the same Sovereign took place at a later period. This circumstance has led M. Ménant to study separately each city, connecting with it the names which have been determined as belonging to it: thus the division we are now examining is interesting as much from the geographical as the historical point of view: and the notices of Sippara and of Babylon, to name only these two, are worth reading. Respecting the former of these cities, our author shows that its history goes back to fabulous times. If we may believe the legend of Berosus, it was at Sippara that Chronos, the supreme god, informed Xisuthrus of the approaching flood, and ordered him to conceal the tables containing the precepts of the divine revelation. There must have been at Sippara, from the earliest antiquity, a library similar to that the remains of which were recently discovered amidst the ruins of Nineveh; and to this circumstance, perhaps, the city owes the name by which it is known in history. The ideogram representing it borrows one of its elements from the Euphrates, but its phonetic expression seems to mean "the city of books." The Berosian fragments designate it as *Παντιβίβλα*; another critic gives us *Πόλις Σιππαρήνων*, and the Bible uses the appellation *Sepharvaim*, which is in the dual number, and means literally "the two Sipparas." We know from ancient texts that, indeed, the city was divided into two distinct parts, separated from one another by the Euphrates, or rather by a canal known as the Nahar-Agané. The two towns had each its peculiar name: the one being called Sipar-sa-Samas, the Sippara consecrated to the god Samas, which is sometimes identified with the sun: the fragments of Berosus describe it as *Πόλις Ἡλίου Σιππάροις*. The other was known as Sipar-sa-Anunit, or, the Sippara dedicated to the goddess Anunit. Such are the remarks which M. Ménant makes on the Sepharvaim of the Old Testament Scriptures: Babylon will come presently under notice.

When the fourth period of Chaldean history opens, the

Digitized by Google

Assyrians have already began their war of annexation and of conquest. Tuklat-pal-assar, about the year 1100 B.C., deals his earliest blows at the greatness of Babylon, which, threatened in the first instance, and subsequently obliged to yield, becomes the vassal of Assyria. This period extends as far as the downfall of Nineveh, about 625 B.C. We now see passing under our eyes the names of princes with which the books of the Old Testament have made us familiar, thus Merodach-Baladan (Marduk-Bal-idin, to give the spelling adopted by the cuneiform texts). *A propos* of this Monarch, our author bids us notice the thorough harmony existing between the Assyrian documents and the Biblical narrative: the chapters, however, referring to the King's embassy (2 Kings xx.; 2 Chron. xxxii.) should necessarily precede those relating to the wars of Sennacherib against Jerusalem. The chronology resulting from the sacred narrative itself requires this transposition.

The fifth period comprises perhaps the most interesting portions of M. Ménant's volume. Babylon has recovered its autonomy, Chaldæa enters upon the epoch of its highest development; the various Monarchs who occupy successively the throne restore the palaces and temples of a city which Nebuchadnezzar entirely transforms, both by bringing its architectural beauty to perfection, and by extending its influence over the greatest part of the civilized world. Whilst collecting together all the documents calculated to illustrate this important period of ancient history, M. Ménant has accumulated details of a most valuable kind, on points connected with biography, topography, archæology, and sacred literature. The description of Babylon, accompanied by maps and plans, is a model of perspicuity and completeness. In giving us an account of the Euphrates, he shows us that, in spite of the hypothesis put forth by certain scholars, it is impossible to discover in the Assyrian name of that river any clue to the ethnographic character of the people who coined that name.

Alluding to the supposed Epistle of Baruch, M. Ménant gives to it a place amongst the canonical books of the Old Testament, and believes, contrary to the opinion of Grotius, Eichorn, Havernick, and others, that it was originally written in Hebrew. It is true that he can quote in support of his views the testimony of scholars enjoying acknowledged reputation, and we will not venture to decide. At any rate the description of the Assyrian deities given in the Epistle of Baruch tallies perfectly well with the representations we find on ancient monuments: in fact, M. Ménant leads us to understand that he has long been accumulating materials with a view to illustrate this interesting subject, and every detail to be found in Baruch can be verified in the course

Digitized by Google

of an archæological visit to the museums of Paris, Berlin, or London.

The prophecies of Daniel occupy naturally an important place in a work on Assyrian history. Our author leaves entirely aside the interpretation of those mysterious visions, and he merely endeavours to show the great value of the book of Daniel as illustrating the state of Chaldean civilization at the time of Nebuchadnezzar. In fact, even if we admit that the *rédaction* of that book, such as we have it now, belongs to an epoch later than the reign of Alexander the Great, we must assign to the subject-matter a much anterior date, for the details with which it furnishes us on the condition of Babylonish intellectual and religious development under the reign of Nebuchadnezzar are characterized by an amount of accuracy to which no Apocryphal writer ever could attain.

M. Ménant has devoted a few remarks on the judgment with which God visited Nebuchadnezzar as a punishment for his pride. He does not attempt to explain it, but simply looks upon it as "un fait qui avaits on explícation naturelle au moment où il était entouré de tout ce qui pouvait le faire comprendre, et qui reste inintelligible aujourd'hui." At the same time he quotes Berosus and Megasthenes to show that the King's mysterious disease was a really historical circumstance, perfectly acknowledged by the most trustworthy annalists.

We come now to the sixth and last period in the history of the Chaldean Empire. Babylon has been taken by the Persians (B.C. 540), and the Aryan element is steadily advancing to conquer the world. During the whole sway of the Achemenides, the life of Babylon was nothing but a protracted agony from which it could not possibly recover. The Macedonians appeared next, and Alexander the Great struck the final blow at a power which had once been the pride and wonder of Western Asia.

We have thus attempted to give to our readers a brief idea of a work which will amply repay the trouble bestowed upon it by historical students. M. Ménant possesses a quality much to be valued just now: he respects the authority of Holy Scripture, and loses no opportunity of showing that far from being contradicted by the discoveries of archæology, the sacred writings every day find in these discoveries fresh and most important confirmation. An appendix of six chronological lists, and eight maps or plans, illustrate the volume.

Digitized by Google

"L' ANTICHRIST," PAR ERNEST RENAN.

REVIEW OF RENAN, in October No. of EDINBURGH REVIEW, 1874.

LETTER II.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Christian Observer and Advocate.*

DEAR SIR,—It will have been observed probably by your readers, that M. Renan, as cited by me at p. 282 of your April No., designates the Apocalypse as St. John's *Manifesto.*[a] Now by a *Manifesto* is meant some public declaration by one in authority on matters of interest and importance to the nation or community addressed (as, for example, on a question of peace or war), with statement of his actuating principles in the matter on the part of him who sends it forth. Thus, the date of the Apocalyptic book being assumed by Renan as, beyond a doubt, the closing weeks of A.D. 68, or first fortnight of A.D. 69, shortly before the death of the Emperor Galba, and moreover that St. John, the only then surviving Apostle of Jesus Christ, was absolutely or virtually its author, he supposes it to have been intended by the Apostle as his declaration to the Asiatic Churches that looked to him as their head (though under covert indeed of symbolic imagery only intelligible by Jews or Christians, and as if a revelation from Jesus Christ Himself), of warning and hate against those whom he looked on as the two chief enemies of the Christian Church:—the one *external;* viz., the persecuting heathen Roman Empire, more especially under the headship of that savage Beast Nero, whom, as restored (or resuscitated, if really dead) from his supposed hiding-place in the East, he herein denounced anticipatively as the actual predicted and dreaded *Antichrist:*—the other *internal;* even St. Paul, though himself indeed recently martyred, but as represented in principles by the Pauline faction of his followers in the Christian Church.

Now of Renan's and his Reviewer's notions and arguments on the *Neronic* part of the theory (if arguments they may be called which are so demonstrably worthless) I spoke in my former Letter; more particularly showing the utter groundlessness of their evidence for the asserted date of the Apocalyptic Book, as January, A.D. 69; on the truth of which date, however, as the Reviewer confesses, "hinges almost wholly the truth of this their Neronic theory of the Apocalypse."[b]

---

[a] So Introd. pp. xxxiii., xli; and also pp. 355, 374.

[b] On two of my objections against Renan's proposed fundamental points of evidence for his Neronic theory of the Apocalyse, I have observed, since the writing of my first letter, corroborative statements by himself.

First, in accord with my assertion that there was no reliable evidence to the

Digitized by Google

So that, had M. Renan restricted himself to the subject of his book's title, "L' Antichrist," and St. John's supposed view of Nero as the man, our refutation of it would here properly have ended. But its title ought rather, and with larger meaning, to have been "L' Apocalypse, l' Antichrist, et St. Jean." For it has been one of his principal objects in writing it to make use of the Apocalypse as a means for the grossest calumnies against the Christians of that primitive Apostolic era, including specially St. Paul, as just hinted, and yet more St. John; indeed against Christianity itself. In all which he is followed by his Reviewer *con amore*. Of the chief of these calumnies then I must also expose the falsehood and absurdity; of the *anti-Johannic* first, as pre-supposed in this part of his Apocalyptic theory; then of the *anti-Pauline*. After which it may be well to glance at the Apocalypse itself, as St. John's supposed own literary composition with a view to these several objects, according to M. Renan.

I. Renan's *Anti-Johannic calumnies.*

His idea is that *St. John*, next to St. James, was of all Christ's Apostles the most ardent *Judaizer*, not even excepting St. Peter; and *his hatred consequently intense against St. Paul*, as the great anti-Judaizing teacher. At p. xxix. of his Introduction he thus writes. "Jean, l'Apôtre, parait avoir été, apres Jacques, le plus ardent des Judeo-Chretiens. L' Apocalypse, de son côté, respire *une haine terrible contre Paul*, et contre ceux qui se relâchaient dans l'observance de la loi Juive." And he adds;—"Le livre repond à merveille au caractère violent et fanatique qui parait avoir été celui de Jean. C'est bien là l'œuvre du Fils de Tonnerre, du terrible Boanerge." And again at p. 347 of his Book;—"Une grande rudesse, une intolerance extreme, un langage dur et grossier contra ceux qui pensaient autrement que lui paraissent avoir été une partie du caractère de Jean." Thus

---

effect that Nero's persecution of Christians, which was begun at Rome A.D. 64, extended *locally* to the Asiatic province, or indeed much beyond Rome itself, there occurs the following remark at p. xxi. of Renan's Introduction, where he is speaking of the οἱ απο της Ιταλιας in chap. xiii. 24 of the Epistle to the Hebrews (an Epistle dated by him A.D. 66);—"Le courant de l'emigration Chretienne (from Rome), fuyant les fureurs de la persecution de Neron, se dirigea vers Ephèse:" *i.e.*, as to a recognised place of safety. So that he virtually admits that in A.D. 69, the date assigned by him to the Apocalypse, there was *there* no Roman Imperial persecution of Christians, though elsewhere perhaps *dully* ("sourdement") continued.—Besides that he also speaks of St. John's banishment to Patmos as an act of St. John's own arrangement, not a Neronically-inflicted penalty on him as a Christian. So pp. 354, 374.

Secondly, at p. xliii. of his Introduction, Renan speaks of the persecuting Roman Imperial power *in the second century* as LA BETE, and as then so designated by the Christians; therewith agreeing with me in regarding that Apocalyptic appellative as in nowise restricted in its application to the particular Emperor Nero. So too p. 414.

Digitized by Google

St. John's bitter spirit of hatred, especially as against St. Paul, is what I may anticipatively designate as Renan's first calumny against *St. John.*

Further, as regards St. John's views of *Christian doctrine*, M. Renan, who had already spoken of him, we saw, as next after St. James the most ardent *Judaizing* Apostle in the Church, infers from the Apocalypse itself that these views were not only *Judaizing*, but also *Ebionite*. So in his Introduction pp. xxxviii., xxxix. I give the passage as translated at p. 489 of the review by his Edinburgh Reviewer, who, with some little reserve, approves and endorses the statements. "The book is *Judeo-Christian, Ebionite.* It is the work of an enthusiast, transported with hatred against the Roman Empire and the profane world.... Its Messianic conceptions are wholly material. The reign of the martyrs for 1000 years is affirmed. The end of the world is announced as imminent. These views, in which the more rational Christians, obeying the direction of St. Paul, saw nothing but difficulties, appear to us [viz. Renan and his admirers] the guarantee of primitive and apostolic authorship." To which Renan himself adds the clause following,—a clause omitted by the Reviewer:—"L'Ebionisme et le Montanisme ne nous font plus peur. Simples historiens nous affirmons même que les adhérens de ces sectes, repoussés par l'orthodoxie, étaient les vrais successeurs de JESUS (!!), des douze, et de la famille du Maître."

Such are Renan's several calumnious misrepresentations of St. John; over and above that of his forgery of the Apocalypse in Jesus Christ's name. Let us now see what is his evidence in proof of them.

(1) In proof of his alleged *spirit of hatred* Renan has none to adduce from documents relative to John's earlier life, save only, that he and his brother James were called by Christ Boanerges, or Sons of Thunder;—that he, *conjointly with the other disciples*, forbade an exorciser who used Christ's name in his exorcisms, because he would not follow after them;—that, together with his brother James, he asked Jesus whether they should call down fire from heaven against the Samaritan city which refused to receive Him for the night, because His face was as though he was going to Jerusalem.[c] This last a case, doubtless, of excessive zeal for his Master. As for the other two, does not Renan expose the weakness of his case *so far* (I mean in reference to St. John's earlier life) by having nothing better to adduce in proof?

---

[c] Mark iii. 17, ix. 38; Luke ix. 53, 54, are the only three passages here referred to by Renan.

Digitized by Google

On the other hand, *on Renan's own implicit confession*, how decisive the counter-evidence! For he admits the authenticity and reliableness of the Book of the Acts. And from it, in the earlier days of the Church there recorded, take just one characteristic trait of this *man of hate*. Imprisoned, and then threatened by the chief priests, Peter and *John* on returning to their own people, made it their prayer that the Lord would support them against their enemies,—how? By sending down fire from heaven on them? Oh, no! but by "stretching out His hands to *heal*," and other such miracles of *mercy*.[d]—Again, M. Renan thus far associates St. John with the fourth Gospel and the Epistle which bear his name, that he thinks the writer cannot but have been connected as a disciple with the Apostle, and that in fact he at times used the pen as his amanuensis.[e] Whence, on his own showing, we may rightly consult those books also for the traits there discernible of St. John's real character. And in the *Gospel* what does he emphasize as his Master's last command to His disciples but this (John xiii. 34): "A new command give I you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another;" followed by those exquisite next five chapters' record of Christ's last discourses of love, with the spirit of which John was evidently himself deeply imbued. And then in the *Epistle* what is the one strain that runs through it but that of *love?* While his counter-testimony, in reprobation of a spirit of *hatred*, is this: "He that hateth his brother is a murderer; and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." (1 John iii. 15.)

Nor differs here the Apocalypse. For whatever is there told of judgment against Christ's enemies is, according to the Book's true title, not John's own outbreathings against the world, as

---

[d] Acts iv. 30.

[e] So Introduction, p. xxxiii.: "L'auteur du quatrième Evangile n'a pu être sans lien quelconque avec l'apôtre Jean." Thus he writes, not without good reason, after notice of sundry very remarkable affinities between the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, especially in regard of the prominent designation of Jesus Christ in either as the *Word of God*. Again p. xxv.: "Nous admettons que parfois le *presbyter* Jean tint la plume pour son maître; et nous regardons comme plausible l'opinion qui lui attribuerait la redaction du quatrième Evangile, et de la première epître dite de Jean." Further, at p. xliv., he speaks of having been found fault with by some German critic for having argued from the fourth Gospel as authority (which he still thinks he did rightly) in his "Vie de Jesus."

I have reasoned above only on what Renan allows as to the measure of St. John's connection with the fourth Gospel. His actual authorship of it has been fully vindicated by many critical expositors. "The universal belief of the Christian Church," says Alford, in his Prolegg. on it, "has ascribed this Gospel to the Apostle John." And he notices and refutes the arguments of the German sceptical school against its genuineness; referring for fuller refutation to treatises by Lücke, Luthard and Ebrard. As for John's first Epistle, no one has ever doubted its having had the same author as the fourth Gospel.

Digitized by Google

Renan would have it, but Christ's inspired predictions of the things which were to come to pass in the impending future. And as to the bitter spirit of hatred against *St. Paul* personally there manifest, it is alleged, M. Renan infers it wholly from what he fancies to have been covert attacks on Paul in the Epistles to the Seven Churches;—a supposition the falsehood of which will be shown under my next head, when speaking of his calumnious insinuations in John's name against St. Paul. Nothing whatever is here really adducible to show that the relationship between St. John and St. Paul was ever different from the brotherly feeling indicated in what Paul himself tells of in Gal. ii. 9: "When James, Cephas, and John perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision."[f]

(2) As to St. John's doctrine, it was preeminently, Renan asserts, *Judeo-Christian* and *Ebionite*.

If we ask, How preeminently *Judeo-Christian?* As usual, Renan on this point seems almost at once to contradict himself. For to the angel of the Church of Thyatira the promise, "I will lay on you no other burden," is explained by him as thus meant by St. John;—"I will lay on you no other burden, in regard of Judaic rites and observances, than obedience to the apostolic injunctions in the first Jerusalem Council recorded in Acts xv.; injunctions participated in, and acted on, by all the Apostles, St. Paul inclusive, in their teaching to the Gentiles.—But wherein, then, St. John's asserted peculiar Judaizing beyond any other of the Apostles except James?" As his proof for this (however herein inconsistent with himself) I suppose that we must turn to what Renan imagines to have been St. John's meaning, in the Apocalypse, when speaking fondly and eulogistically of Jerusalem, of its temple, and of Jews; viz., as if all these terms were meant by the Apostle literally. Especially so on Apoc. xi. 1, 2, where he supposes John to have intimated the temple's indestructibility, save only as regarded the outer Gentile Court, as guaranteed by God Himself. In his view of which

[f] Admitting that something of kindliness may have existed in St. John's character,—not so much indeed as proved from the above specified evidences, but more especially as implied in the Alexandrian Clement's well-known story of his tenderness to the young apostatised robber after his own return in old age from Patmos,—Renan argues its perfect compatibility with the spirit of bitter hatred which he ascribes to him, by comparison of the case of some of the fanatical *Inquisitors* of the 13th or 14th centuries. For, says he, we may suppose them to have felt kindly to private friends, though delighting to torture and burn heretics at the stake (p. 348). A comparison which his admiring Reviewer cites approvingly, as probably "not very far from the truth."—*Edinburgh Review*, p. 497.—And this of Jesus Christ's loving and beloved disciple!

Digitized by Google

he would seem to make St. John Judaize to the extent not merely of *Judeo-Christianity*, but almost of *Judaism*. For, were the continuance of the Temple in its essential parts thus guaranteed, must not the continuance of the *Jewish Priesthood* have been understood as therewith guaranteed also? Whence, further, men's justification by the works of the ceremonial law, not through Christ's atoning death and righteousness.[g] Now Renan's total misconception herein of the purport of the temple scene, and other Jewish symbols, as well as of the lauded titles of Jew, or Israel, in the Apocalypse, was noticed in my former letter (p. 281), and that they were figurative, very much as here and there, in St. Paul's Epistles[h] of *Christian* realities. Indeed on Apoc. vii. Renan himself (pp. 389, 390) feels constrained to explain the 144,000 sealed Israelites as not Jews only, but "the spiritual Israel," inclusive of Christian converts from heathenism. And, as to his idea of St. John's expecting the continuance of the earthly temple at Jerusalem as Divinely guaranteed, ought not what John tells of the new Jerusalem in Apoc. xxi., as "descending from heaven, and having no temple," to have disabused him of the idea?

So much as to St. John's *Judeo-Christianity*, as markedly shown, according to Renan, in the Apocalypse.

And is the charge of *Ebionitism*, as if there manifested, at all better proved? For a negative to this as decisive as to Renan's other charges against St. John, we have only to inquire what *Ebionite* doctrine was in the early times of Christianity. And really, considering the probable ignorance of most of his readers on the point,—an ignorance such as he just glances at on page xlv. of his Introduction,—one might almost have expected that he would have favoured them with the needed explanation; the rather, as the word is again and again and again repeated, as characteristic of St. John's apocalyptic doctrine. By Origen, then, the earliest father I believe of the Christian Church who notices them, the following is the brief description given of the Ebionite sect, and their heretical opinions. "There were two sorts of Ebionites;—some who believed Jesus to have been born of a virgin, as we do; some who suppose Him to have been born, as other men are. . . . Each of them, however, were alike fond of Jewish observances; and each alike rejected St. Paul's Epistles, considering him as neither a wise nor good man." Further, of the former less flagrantly heretical sect Eusebius says, "that,

[g] Such seems indeed to be the Reviewer's notion of St. John's expectations and wishes (p. 498):—"St. John, a Hebrew Christian schooled, not by St. Paul, but by the Targumists and Rabbis, etc."

[h] *e.g.*, Gal. iv. 26,—"Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all;" Rom. ii. 28,—"He is not a Jew that is one outwardly;" ix. 6. "They are not all Israel that are of Israel."

Digitized by Google

although judging Christ to have been born of a virgin, they yet do not acknowledge His pre-existence as God the Word:" adding, in accordance with Origen, "that they esteemed the ritual observances of the Mosaic law to be necessarily binding; and that they rejected Paul's Epistles, calling him an apostate from the faith."[1] Now, as regards St. John's characterization by M. Renan as a *Judeo-Christian*,—which seems thus to be involved in his Ebionitism,—I have already shown it to be altogether unfounded; and the same as to his asserted hatred of St. Paul. Thus there only remains the charge of St. John's denial, with the Ebionites, of Jesus Christ's pre-existence before His birth into our world. And, in refutation, what can be more decisive than Jesus Christ's own statement respecting Himself, *according to St. John*, at the very opening of the Apocalypse;—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come." (Apoc. i. 8—11.) The same, too, at the close of the book. Now Renan admits the genuineness of these verses, as of St. John's authorship.

II. Next, as to what Renan supposes (and his Reviewer here, as usual, follows him) to have been St. John's *charges against St. Paul.*

It is in the Epistles to the seven Asiatic Churches, and as an anti-Pauline warning which would be understood by them, that Renan supposes the several charges to have been covertly insinuated. Thus, first, on those words to the Church at Ephesus, "Thou hast tried them that say they are apostles, and are not," "Içi," says Renan, p. 363, "allusion à St. Paul." Then on "This thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the *Nicolaitans*, which I also hate," he notes: "Des partisans de St. Paul." Further, on the address to the Church at Smyrna, "I know the blasphemies of them that *say that they are Jews*, and who are not, but who are a synagogue of Satan," he explains: "Les reunions religieuses des partisans de S. Paul sont pour notre auteur des fêtes d'idolatrie, puisqu'on y mange des viandes sacrifieés aux idoles." Again, on that to Pergamos, "I have against thee that thou hast them that hold the doctrine of *Balaam*, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat meat sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication," he says: "Nouvelle allusion aux partisans de St. Paul." Again, on that to Thyatira, "I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman *Jezebel*, who calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat meats sacrificed to idols," his

[1] These and other patristic testimonies to much the same effect are given by Lardner. Vol. II., 327, 348; VI., 382.

Digitized by Google

note is: "Il s'agit içi de quelque femme influente de Thyateire, disciple de Paul." (After which, and on that clause, "I will lay upon you no other burden," comes the notable explanation by Renan which has been already quoted by me, restricting St. John's requirements from the Churches simply to those laid down by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem.) Finally, on those words to Philadelphia, "I will make them of the synagogue of Satan which say they are Jews, and are not, to come and worship before thy feet," he thus notes: "Allusion aux disciples de St. Paul, qui seront obligés de venir demander pardon aux *Judeo-Chretiens*, et de reconnoitre que ceuxci sont la vraie eglise."

Thus, summarizing, it seems that M. Renan supposes St. John, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to denounce St. Paul as one that called himself an Apostle, and was not; that permitted, and almost encouraged, idolatry among his heathen converts, teaching the lawfulness of participation in the heathen idol-feasts, and even in heathen habits of fornication and impurity. Such are in the Epistles themselves indicated as the characteristic tenets and practices associated with the names Balaam and Jezebel. And similar, it appears, were eminently the foul characteristics of the heretical sect of the Nicolaitans.[j]

Now how any one, admitting what Renan does as authentic historical documents,—viz., the Acts and chief Pauline Epistles,—can suppose any sensible man of the time, such as he says St. John eminently was, to have made these charges against St. Paul, seems more than marvellous. As regards Paul's *apostleship*, what can be more express than his call to it by revelation from Jesus Christ, as related in Acts ix.? Or than the other Apostles' loving recognition of his call, as told in Acts xv. 25, 26? Again, as to the charge of his encouraging idolatry, and the impurities and fornications usually attendant on it, what can be more express against all such teaching than his? "Dearly beloved, flee from idolatry." "Flee fornication." "Let not such things be even named among you, as becometh saints." "The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, etc.; of which I told you beforehand, and now tell you again, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of Christ, and of God."[k] As

[j] See a good summary of patristic testimonies respecting the Nicolaitan heretics to this effect in Alford on Apoc. ii. 6.

[k] 1 Cor. x. 14, vi. 16; Gal. v. 20; Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 3, etc. At pp. 14, 15, as if his only ground for supposing the Apocalyptic charges *anti-Pauline*, Renan has the following extraordinary statement respecting *Judeo-Christian* emissaries' incessant pursuit of St. Paul, and everywhere spreading these odious calumnies against him, as confessed to by Paul himself. "Paul, presenté sous les traits d'un homme qui enseigna à manger des viandes sacrifiées aux idoles, et à forniquer avec des paiennes, est signalé d'avance, et designé à la vindicte

Digitized by Google

to the particular charge of permitting *the eating of meats offered to idols*, what can be more wise, Christian, and conformable, too, with the apostolic injunctions at the Council of Jerusalem (the same that were referred to approvingly by St. John himself, according to M. Renan), than Paul's instructions on the subject to his heathen converts in 1 Cor. viii. 1—10; x. 20—33; Rom. xiv. 14, 15? The purport of which was that they were on no account to eat *εἰδωλόθυτα* in heathen temples, or parts of them at meals with heathen neighbours, if told that such was the fact; and this not for their own conscience sake, knowing as they did that an idol was in reality nothing, but for the consciences of others near them.

Surely, had St. John really indited and intended such charges against St. Paul, though under covert of other names, in these Apocalyptic passages, as M. Renan supposes, it would have been so notoriously false as to have rendered him ridiculous in the sight of the Asiatic Christians. What, then, of Renan's suggestion, and his Reviewer's glad adoption of the idea? Seems it not to illustrate how men's common sense, as well as moral sense, is impaired to an extent such as at length to render them incapable of discerning truth, or appreciating moral evidence, where there has been a willing abandonment of the mind to religious scepticism? "Professing themselves to be wise they become fools."—But can it be that *guilt* is wanting in the matter? Were the case to be brought home to the real delinquent, in any of our judicial tribunals, of cunningly devised ascription to one of our most esteemed Prelates of foulest slandering of another Prelate equally esteemed, would the convicted slanderer find admission afterwards into the circles of really respectable society? What then, as in the case before us, where deliberate and malignant slander of one of the blessed Apostles, with not a shred of reliable evidence to warrant it, Scriptural, or other than Scriptural,[1] has been palmed upon another of that blessed apostolic company! Aye, and slander too against another

---

de tous." For he adds, "This would be incredible, were it not Paul himself who tells us." Where then does Paul say so? Renan's only authorities given are Phil. i. 15, 17; ii. 20, 21. Does he then say so in those verses? "Some preach Christ of contention and envy, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: the others of good will and love." This is all. Not one word as to these men accusing him of teaching the eating of *εἰδωλόθυτα*, and fornication! Now can Renan have been unconscious of his falsehood in the references to Phil. i., ii., as authority for his statement?

[1] Who in the next Apostolic times could be a truer representative of St. John than his disciple Polycarp? And does he take up the accusations against St. Paul that we have seen ascribed by Renan and his Reviewer to St. John? What read we in sections ix. and xi. of his Epistle to the Philippians? "The righteousness and patience which ye have seen set forth before your eyes, in Paul himself, and the rest of the Apostles;" "You, among whom the blessed Paul laboured," etc.

Digitized by Google

yet higher, even HIM whose name is above every name, of things on earth and things in heaven.

A 3rd point which I had proposed to consider, in further illustration of the absurdity of Renan's Apocalyptic theory, was his treatment of the cumbrous appendage of the rest of the Apocalyptic treatise to those parts on which almost alone he dwells, as alone expressing the two points of St. John's supposed "Manifesto" of warning and hate against St. Paul, and against Nero, to the seven Asiatic Churches. But this, I see, would occupy too much time and space. I must beg permission, therefore, to ask room in another number of your Periodical for briefly illustrating that, and some other connected points of no little importance on the subject of the Apocalypse and Antichrist, thereby suggested.

Yours faithfully,
E. B. ELLIOTT.

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. II.

(1) *The Ascending or Burnt Offering.*

ACCORDING to the literal sense of the Hebrew word, the burnt-offering was an ascension or ascending-offering. Its main object appears to have been to set forth God's acceptance of the offerer, who, in this rite, dedicated himself wholly to the Lord.

Detailed directions as to the way in which it was to be offered are given in the first chapter of Leviticus. The Israelite who wished to bring a *corban*,—that is to say, a present,—unto the Lord, was to select a male which was without blemish from his herd or flock, and bring it for his acceptance[a] to the entrance or door-way, which was at the eastern end of the sacred enclosure. His first act was to identify himself with the victim by the pressure of his hands on its head, in order that it might be accepted as his representative, and that the atoning mercy of God might be extended over him. The laying on of hands here inculcated was not supposed to communicate any virtue to the victim. It was to be hard and heavy pressure, and was to symbolize the transference of the guilt and infirmities of the offerer to the atoning medium. From the moment of this ritual action, whatever happened to the victim was regarded ceremonially as happening to the offerer.

[a] It is generally agreed that this is the true meaning of the word rendered by our Authorized Version "of his own voluntary will;" and it is important to observe the fact, as it characterizes the spirit and intention of the offerer.

Digitized by Google

The victim was now slain before the Lord, as a solemn and prescribed religious performance. It is frequently supposed that this was the priest's act, but a careful reading of the text will show that such was not the case. It may have been also the offerer's duty to flay the victim, to cut it in pieces, and to wash the various parts with water. Probably, however, these tasks were generally performed by the Levites.

And now the offerer had done his part, and nothing remained for him but to *watch* and to *believe*, whilst the priests, the family of Aaron, performed their peculiar functions.

The essential duties of the priest were, first, to sprinkle, or rather pour forth, the victim's blood, which had been collected in a vessel for the purpose, upon the large altar which stood near the entrance of the sacred enclosure; and, secondly, to lay all the parts of the animal, including the head and the fat, in order upon the altar-fire, to which he had previously added fresh wood. Thus, by his instrumentality, the whole of the victim was to take fire and arise in clouds of vapour into the heavens; and this was a token that He who dwelleth on high was willing to accept the offerer and his services, in spite of their many deficiences, as a sweet-smelling savour.

It is interesting to inquire what were the relative positions of the priest and offerer in this service. The Israelite when he slew the victim was to stand at the side of the altar, northward (Lev. i. 11): he was thus in a position where he could observe all that took place. The priest, probably, would come from the sanctuary as God's representative, and stand on the west side, with his face towards the east, and thus towards the worshippers generally. It seems to be generally believed that at the time of offering the priest stood with his back to the people; but what authority is there for this idea? In Joel ii. 17 the priests are described as weeping and praying "between the porch and the altar," [b] that is to say, between the vestibule of the temple itself and the altar of burnt-offerings which was in the court. Our ideas on this subject are rather confused from the application of the word altar to the Communion Table. If the Holy Table were set in the churchyard, and if the ministers prayed with their backs towards the church, and their faces towards a victim which was ascending in a cloud of vapour from off the Table, we should have a far better representation of what actually took place under the Old Dispensation. The immediate proximity of the priest and offerer, and the absence of mystery in the proceedings of the priest, setting forth as they do the fact that there

[b] Compare also Ezek. viii. 16.

Digitized by Google

is no distance or separation between Christ and His people, are to be observed.

It has already been noticed that ascending-offerings were to be presented to the Lord, together with wheaten-offerings and libations, every morning and every evening. In fact, the fire on the Great Altar was always kept smouldering on, being constantly fed with these gifts, so that the people might regard themselves as in a state of continued acceptance with God. The order to this effect was given to Moses in the following terms:—"Now this is that which thou shalt offer (literally, *do*) on the altar; two lambs of the first year day by day continually. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even (literally, *between the evenings*). And with the one lamb a tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil; and the fourth part of an hin of wine for a libation. And the other lamb thou shalt offer at even, and shalt offer with it the same wheaten-offering as that of the morning, and with the same libation, for a sweet savour, a fire-offering unto the Lord. This shall be a continual ascending-offering throughout your generations, at the entrance of the Tabernacle of Meeting, before the Lord, where I will meet you to speak unto you. There will I meet the children of Israel, and it shall be sanctified by my glory." (Ex. xxix. 38, etc.; Num. xv. 3—11; xxviii. 3, etc. See also Lev. vi. 9—13.)

Ascending-offerings were very frequently combined with other kinds of offering. Thus they were presented together with sacrificial feasts when the covenant was made (Ex. xxiv. 5), and on the occasion of the Passover in Josiah's reign (2 Chron. xxxv. 14). They were appointed to be presented with sin-offerings on the occasion of a priest's consecration. They were offered in large numbers at Solomon's anointing, and on his accession. (1 Chron. xxix, 21; 1 Kings iii. 4; 2 Chron. i. 5, 6.) When the temple was completed the Lord showed His special pleasure in the work by sending fire from heaven, which consumed (literally, *eat up*) the ascending-offerings as well as the fat of the sacrificial feasts. (2 Chron. vii. 1, 7.) Elijah's offering, which was prepared under very peculiar circumstances at the ordinary time for the ascending of the (evening) sacrifice, was consumed in a similar way (1 Kings xviii. 38); and the fact that God answered by fire was taken as a proof that He was indeed God in Israel.

Manoah's offering was one of remarkable interest. On the second appearance of the angel, Manoah says, "'Let us detain thee whilst we offer (or prepare) a kid for thee.' And the angel of the Lord said unto Manoah, 'Though thou detain me I will not eat of thy bread, and if thou offerest an ascending-offering

Digitized by Google

thou shalt offer it unto the Lord.' .... So Manoah took a kid, with a wheaten-offering, and offered it (or caused it to ascend) upon a rock unto the Lord. And the angel did,—according to his name,—*wondrously;* for it came to pass when the flame ascended toward heaven from off the altar the angel of the Lord ascended in the flame of the altar." He thus seemed to identify himself with the victim. Who then was this angel of the Lord? Is it not in the highest degree probable that He was a manifestation of the Divine Being? Was He not the same of whom it was afterwards written, "His name shall be called *Wonderful*"? Was He not the same who, after He had purged our sins, was seen to ascend into the heavens, until at length a cloud received Him out of the sight of His disciples?

Another interesting narrative in which the ascending-offering is mentioned is that recorded in 2 Sam. xxiv. 18—25 and 1 Chron. xxi. 26. The destroying angel had been ordered to go forth and smite the people with pestilence in consequence of David's sin. When he perceived this mysterious being standing betwixt heaven and earth, with his hand stretched over Jerusalem, David pleaded earnestly that the punishment might come on himself and on his father's house, not on the innocent people. At the inspired suggestion of the prophet Gad, he proceeded to build an altar on the threshing-floor of Ornan, or Araunah, and bought the oxen for ascending-offerings, the wheat for meat-offerings, and the threshing instruments for wood. He then called on the name of the Lord, and the Lord answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offering. The work of destruction ceased, and David, seeing that the Lord had accepted him and had heard his prayer (according to the pious wish of Ornan, "The Lord accept thee"), held a sacrificial feast of peace-offerings there. The spot thus consecrated to God was on Mount Moriah, and was appointed immediately afterwards as the site of the temple of Solomon. (See 1 Chron. xxii. 1; 2 Chron. iii. 1.)

(2) *Prayer and Praise the Accompaniments of the Burnt-offering.*

In some of the instances above referred to it will be observed that the offerings were accompanied with prayer and praise. This was usually if not always the case. The worshipper approached God in His appointed way, in a spirit of humility and self-dedication, and whilst the victim, which was his accepted representative, ascended into the heavens, he ascended thither also in heart and mind, and his prayers entered the sacred presence chamber of the Most High. Thus we read in 1 Sam. vii. 9, "Then Samuel took a sucking lamb, and offered it for an

Digitized by Google

ascending-offering wholly unto the Lord: and Samuel cried unto the Lord for Israel; and the Lord hearkened to him. And as Samuel was offering it, the Philistines drew near to battle; but the Lord discomfited them." Again, when Darius renewed the decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the temple, he ordered that the people should have "that which they have need of, both young bullocks and rams and lambs, for the ascending-offerings of the God of heaven, with wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the appointment of the priests at Jerusalem, day by day without fail: that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savour unto the God of heaven, *and pray for the life of the King, and of his sons.*" (Ezra vi. 9, 10.)

The time of the evening offering was especially regarded amongst the people as a suitable opportunity for prayer, an accepted time, when they might be heard. The case of Elijah has already been noticed; that of Ezra is very striking. News had been brought to him that "the holy seed" had mixed themselves with the people of the land,—the Canaanites and others. He was deeply moved, and whilst those that trembled at God's word gradually gathered round Him, he still remained overwhelmed with sorrow until the evening sacrifice: then he arose, fell on his knees, spread out his hands before the Lord, and made a most solemn confession of the national sin.

Though the case of Job takes us back to patriarchal times, yet it may be referred to. It was his custom to offer ascending-offerings, according to the number of his sons, early in the morning, for, he said, "It may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts." (Job. i. 5.) After his restoration his friends were ordered to take seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to Job and offer up for themselves an ascending offering, and, the Lord adds, "My servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept; lest I deal with you after your folly." (Job. xlii. 8.)

Thus the time of offering was regarded as a time of blessing. It is in accordance with this sentiment that we find David blessing the people immediately after offering. (1 Chron. xvi. 2.) Moreover, the duties of offering to God and blessing man in His name were linked together as the special privileges of the house of Aaron. (1 Chron. xxiii. 13.) Prayer, praise, and blessing were combined with a variety of offerings at the dedication of the temple. (See 2 Chron. vii.) There was music also as an accompaniment to the offerings, probably not on this occasion only but frequently, for we read in 2 Chron. vii. 6, "The priests waited on their offices: the Levites also with instruments of music of the Lord, which David the King had made to praise the Lord, because His mercy endureth for ever, when David praised by their ministry; and the priests sounded the trumpets

Digitized by Google

before them, and all Israel stood." The scene as described in 2 Chron. xxix., in the days of Hezekiah, must have been most impressive: "He set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the King's seer, and Nathan the prophet: for so was the commandment of the Lord by His prophets. And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets. And Hezekiah commanded to offer the ascending-offering upon the altar. And as the ascending-offering began, the song of the Lord began also with the trumpets, and with the instruments ordained by David King of Israel. And all the congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpets sounded; and all this continued until the ascending-offering was finished."

(3) *The Meat-offering and Drink-offering.*

That which is called a meat-offering in the English Bible was not "meat" in our sense of the word, for it was made of flour. The Hebrew name *minchah* simply signifies a gift, and is often used in this sense. The ascending-offering was always to be accompanied with one of these flour-offerings, as well as with a drink-offering or libation. (Num. xv. 4, 5.) If the ascending-offering was a lamb, the minchah was to consist of a tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of oil, and accompanied with the fourth part of a hin of wine. These proportions were to be increased if the ascending-offering was a ram or a bullock.

Thus corn, wine, and oil, the three leading vegetable products of the East,—themselves God's gifts to man,—were to be presented to the Creator by the grateful worshipper.

The ritual of the minchah, or wheaten-offering, is to be found in Lev. ii. and vi. 14—18. It was presented in various forms. It might be grain beaten out of the ears, or flour pounded fine, or a cake, or a biscuit or wafer. A special direction for the *breaking* of the cake is given in the one case, and something like it is implied throughout, as the priest was obliged to take a handful to burn. Oil was to be added, and it was to be seasoned with salt, so that even the mineral world might contribute to the offerings of the Lord. The minchah was to be offered without leaven, whether in the form of old sour dough or of honey, in order that it might be pure and uncorrupted.

Although this offering was so simple in its character, yet it could not be accepted without the intervention of the priest and the altar, as part had to ascend with frankincense through the sacerdotal ministrations, and the remainder was to be eaten by

Digitized by Google

the priest himself and the males of his family, with unleavened bread, in the holy place.

The wave-sheaf of the first ripe corn was not properly a minchah, and none of it was burnt. (Lev. ii. 12 and xxiii. 10, 11.) The same appears to be the case with the wave-loaves made with leaven, which represented the ordinary food of the people. (Lev. xxiii. 17—20.) But the first green ears which sprouted forth in spring were to be dried by the fire, and the grains which were beaten out of them after this artificial ripening were to be treated as the other meat-offerings.

There was this peculiar distinction between the meat-offering and the ascending-offering,—that while the latter was wholly turned to vapour on the altar, so that it might ascend into the heavens, only a portion of the former so ascended, the rest being eaten by the priest. The portion which ascended was mingled with sweet incense, and was called the *Memorial*, because it was intended ceremonially to call to God's remembrance the fact that the whole was offered: the part represented the whole, and the whole represented the offerer.

It has been supposed by some writers whose opinions are worthy of respectful attention that the Lord referred to this memorial when He said with reference to the Lord's Supper, "Do this *in remembrance* of Me." (Luke xxii. 19.) But the Greek word always used in the Septuagint for the "memorial" of the meat-offering is in a different form from that here rendered "remembrance;" and we may be tolerably certain that the same word would have been used if there had been any reference to that rite. Moreover there was a material distinction in other respects between the two ordinances. They were not at all analogous. The "memorial" was neither eaten by the worshipper nor by the priest, but was burnt, and thus ascended into the heavens in a cloud of vapour; but that which was presented by the Lord in the Last Supper was to be eaten by the worshipper. We must look not to the meat-offering but to the Passover feast in order to find analogies for the Lord's Supper; and for a reference to the "memorial" of the minchah we may perhaps turn to Acts x. 4, 31, where the prayers and alms of Cornelius are described as coming up, or "ascending," for a "memorial" in the presence of God. This point becomes more clear when we remember that Cornelius was worshipping "at the ninth hour," the regular hour of prayer, and the appointed time for the evening minchah. Compare the third verse with Acts iii. 1.

There are some passages in which the word minchah occurs in the Old Testament which call for a few remarks. In Psalm xcvi. 8 the heathen nations are exhorted to bring a minchah and

Digitized by Google

come into God's courts. There is nothing in the immediate context to show whether the word is here to be understood in its Levitical sense, or in its more general usage,—*i.e.*, as a gift. Our translators appear to have taken it in the latter sense. We may illustrate the meaning of the passage by Isa. lvi. 7, where it is said that the sons of the stranger who join themselves to the Lord by covenant shall come to God's holy mountain and shall be made joyful in His house of prayer; their ascending-offerings and their sacrificial feasts shall be offered (the one in *whole*, the other *in part*) upon God's altar, and shall be accepted; for God's house shall be a house of prayer for all nations. Similarly we read in Zech. viii. 22, 23, that "many nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord;" men of all languages uniting with the Jews in the worship of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This prediction is repeated in the fourteenth chapter, where the joyous Feast of Tabernacles is specified as the solemnity which the nations will not only be invited but also positively ordered to observe.

The question arises whether these passages will be fulfilled literally and locally, or whether they simply teach that men of all nations were to form part of the Church which originally sprang out of Israel. Certainly the Church of Christ is regarded in the New Testament as the true Israel. Its members offer spiritual sacrifices to the Lord in His holy Temple, and their mother city, or metropolis, is Jerusalem that is above. The general teaching of the Scripture is clear on this point; but at the same time many students of prophecy see strong ground for holding that there will be a material and local fulfilment of all such predictions as the one above specified.

In Malachi i. 6, etc., the priests are severely rebuked for offering polluted bread on the Lord's altar, and for carrying out the Temple services with the object of getting gain. In contrast with these polluted gifts, the Lord announces that His name should be great among the Gentiles, and that in every place (*i.e.*, not in Jerusalem only) a pure and unpolluted minchah, together with incense, should be offered to Him. Is the reference here to a literal minchah and to literal incense? or are these words to be interpreted in accordance with the prophecies already referred to? Here, again, the wider interpretation seems to be the safest, without necessarily excluding the other; and our Lord furnishes a justification for this view in John iv. 21, where we read, "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem worship the Father." True worship was no longer to be restricted to Mount Gerizim or to Mount Moriah, but was to be carried on in every place, and was to be acceptable everywhere,

Digitized by Google

provided it was offered "in spirit and in truth," and without the leaven of malice and wickedness.

It has been supposed that another illustration of the same point might possibly be found in Ps. cxli. 2, where the Psalmist thus speaks: "Let my prayer be set forth before Thee *(as)* incense, and the lifting up of my hands *(as)* the evening minchah." David evidently realized the relationship between the sign and the reality, and whilst highly valuing the appointed rite, he longed that acceptance might be extended not only to the wheaten-offering and incense, which was ensured to him through the medium of priestly ministrations, but also to the prayers and aspirations of his heart, which went directly up to the throne of grace at the same time. This passage, however, by no means implies that the Psalmist had any idea of substituting prayer for ceremony and rite. The two were closely bound together in his mind. He was under "the schoolmaster." It was only in later days, when the captivity caused a temporary cessation of Levitical ceremony, that there was any approach to the substitution of spiritual worship for ceremonial. In fact all through the history of Israel and up to the time of Christ these two kinds of approach were more or less supposed *(and rightly)* to be bound up in one. The worship of the Jew was really of the same character as that of the Christian, but now the mode of access through typical offering and priest has given way to a higher and more perfect mode through Him who is the Living Way.

(4) *Incense.*

The burning of incense was one of the special functions of the priesthood, which no one might invade on pain of death. Like the sprinkling of the blood on the altar and the ascending of the victim in a cloud of vapour, it represented God's work, not man's, and was therefore to be performed by him who acted on behalf of men in things pertaining to God.

The ascending-offering was in itself of the nature of incense; and when we read (*e.g.*, in Lev. i. 9) that the priest was to *burn* all on the altar, we are to understand, according to the original, that he was to vaporize it, or turn it into a cloud, which should arise as a sweet savour before the Lord. The word used for the burning of the bodies of certain sin-offerings which were consumed without the camp, has a totally different meaning.

Whatever arose from the altar was practically identified with the ascending-offering, and set forth the acceptance of the worshipper,—of his prayers and of his services,—as a sweet savour. The "memorial," or handful of the wheaten-offering, which was thus vaporized, may have had frankincense added to

Digitized by Google

it, so as to indicate this fact the more clearly. But *frankincense* (Lev. ii. 2) was a different thing from the sacred compound called *incense*. It was the gum of an Arabian shrub which burnt with a peculiarly bright, steady flame. The Hebrew word for it has unfortunately been translated "incense" in the Authorized Version, in six passages, where it would be best to restore the word "frankincense," so as to keep up the proper distinction. (See Is. xliii. 23; lx. 6; lxvi. 3, see margin; Jer. vi. 20; xvii. 26; xli. 5.) In these passages it will be seen that the frankincense was brought by the worshipper to present with his wheaten-offering, and was not the sacred incense which none but the house of Levi might prepare.

Incense proper was compounded of three kinds of spices, namely, stacte, onycha, and galbanum, together with frankincense. It was to be *salted* (see margin Ex. xxx. 35), beaten very small, and put before the Testimony,—*i.e.*, the Ark,—in the sacred place of meeting, not within the most holy place, but immediately before the veil. The altar of incense was simply a small stand, a foot and half square and three feet high, with horns at the corners, overlaid with gold on its roof and walls (Ex. xxx. 3, *margin*), so that it looked like a miniature flat-roofed golden house. Twice a day, as nearly as possible at the time of offering the ascending-offering and minchah and libation, the priest was to go into the holy place, to dress the lamps in the morning and to light them in the evening. He was then to set fire to some incense by means of a live coal from the altar outside, and to let it burn as a sweet vapour in a vessel on the golden stand or altar before the veil.

Thus the doctrine of acceptance, which was manifested in the ascending-offering in the presence of all who sought the Lord, was set forth in another form within the holy place, where the eye of the worshipper could not penetrate; and probably many people would engage in prayer outside whilst the incense was rising up before God inside. (Luke i. 10.) The live coal was a connecting link between the ascending-offerings which went up in the outer court and the analogous ordinance carried on within the veil.

In the vision contained in the sixth of Isaiah the seer penetrated in spirit within the second veil to the very throne of God, and saw in figure objects similar to those contained in the most holy place. Oppressed with a sense of his sin and consequent danger,—for death was the punishment for unprivileged entrance into the sanctuary,—the prophet cries out, "Alas! for I am cut off; for I am a man of unclean lips .... for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts." Then it was that one of the seraphim (literally, burning ones,—for God's ministers are

Digitized by Google

as a flame of fire) was represented as doing the priest's part. He took the live coal with the tongs from the altar, and with his hand caused it to touch the prophet's mouth. This was to indicate that the infirmity of his speech and the heart-sin which that infirmity indicated were purged away. The prophet adds that the house was filled with smoke. This answered to the smoke of the incense which daily ascended before the veil, and which was permitted once a year to penetrate within.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

CHURCHYARD THOUGHTS.—A FRAGMENT.

ST. JOHN xx. 11—18.
ST. PETER I. i. 8, 4.

* * * * *

YES, linger still a moment, while the flush
Of summer sunset in the northern sky
Behind the dark tower wavers, and above,
Just trembling into sight, the starry Seven
And golden-clear Arcturus, gem the blue:
Here linger, leaning on one stone that bears
Two names,—to us how dear!—the buried friend
And his once buried Saviour. Let the hour
Of sacred silence and yon pulsing light
Have all their influence. By this English grave
Remember, and with joy, how to one spot
Of Palestinian sepulture the hearts
Of sinners, dying, or who mourn the dead,
Turn and are blest. Across the vast of space,—
Islands, and seas, and continents,—our thought
Flies instant; and across the vast of time,
And with a thankful weariness, finds rest
On that recorded hour, when in the dusk
Beside his cavern-door, the LORD appeared
To Mary, first.
Above the deep ravine
Of chiming Cedron, in the broken cliff,
Had Joseph hewn his garden; and the ridge
Of Olivet against the rising sun
Now filled it with the twilight of the morn,
Though the clear vault with fleecy clouds aloft
Fast kindled, and the pinnacles were seen
Of the gold-fretted Temple's hill of snow
Sparkling.[a] But in the garden, the gray dawn
With sober light uncoloured showed the grot,
A dark-browed chamber in the rocky wall,

---

[a] So Josephus paints it. ("Wars," v. 5.)

Digitized by Google

Vacant,—the door-stone on the garden path
Cast outward. There, beside that open door,
The woman, ceasing the long shower of grief,
Knelt at His foot; and in the calm profound
Of joy unhoped for, certain, and supreme,
Heard, word on word, His utterance; while the trees
Whispered, and from their leaves the drops of night
Fell as they stirred. His living voice was there;
Beyond the tomb He stood, yet at her side:
"*Nay, touch me now no more; believe me here,*
Not yet ascended, Mary. Go, and tell
My brethren I ascend to yonder heaven,—
To where my Father and their Father dwells,
My God, their God."
So from that blissful grove,
From the still precincts of that sepulchre,
She passed, obedient. Through the city-streets
'Midst the first foot-falls of the morn she went
Seeking the scattered brethren; and to each,
With glad reiteration still in turn
Delivering the same story,—she had seen
The Lord, and He had spoken thus to her.

Blest herald of redemption, first to bear
Into these dying scenes of guilt and care
The tidings of that sepulchre unsealed;
The marvel, the simplicity divine,
The nameless joy, not dreamed of, but revealed;
The eternal light *we* had not taught to shine,
Kindled by JESUS! She, with one calm word
That she had seen arisen her buried Lord,
And from his lips had heard in that glad hour,
For those who left him in his pain alone,
News, not of wrath, but of his rising power
And session for them on his Father's throne,—
She first awoke the never-ending voice,
Redeemer, of thy Gospel; that new song
In which innumerable souls rejoice,
Who (though in seeming triumph oft and long
Death wounds them, spoiling from their love's embrace
Its fondest treasures, and themselves meanwhile
Claiming his prey) yet in thy living grace
Find more than resignation; with a smile
Of strange delight discovering for their own
Thy sacrifice and resurrection-crown.

She first, all-happy Magdalena, bore
From Joseph's grot the bliss unheard before;
And still her tidings was the broken tomb;
And still, though ages roll,
That message from the soul,
And that alone, must chase the enfolding gloom:

Digitized by Google

Here still the worn and wandering mind
Its true repose must find;
Here learn the secret that can save—
Beside, within, that grave.
Here still the heart can feel, and only here,
The tide of joy that brings no mingled fear
Of ebbing languor soon to fleet amain;
(The soon-exhausted life
In faint and flagging strife
Seeking its vanished gladness to regain);
Not here from fancy's haunted well
Uncertain waters swell,
But pour descending, never dry,
From truth's own fount on high.
Yes, truth indeed is here; the event divine,
O Saviour Lord, the work that all is thine;
Once, once for all, with all its sequel, done:
Not in ourselves, but Thee,
The Almighty cause we see,
Which endless through its vast effects must run:
Here we may trust to Thee the scope
Of our undying hope;
Here we may know our doubts are vain,
For Thou art risen again.
We by no far-drawn reasonings,—brilliant length,
But fragile,—hold our heaven. For us the strength
Of demonstration is the Risen-One still:
Our wisdom, science, all,
Is at thy feet to fall;
Thou art our thought profound, our logic skill:
Our evidence of deathless bliss,
Our earnest, still is this,—
That we have seen from death restored
Thy face, belovéd Lord.
So let us tune,—beneath the upkindling sphere,
Where stars on stars, thy handiwork, appear
Now gathering deep,—our parting sound of praise:
Here, midst the twinkling gloom,
Here, by this long-loved tomb,
Through Thee we antedate the eternal lays:
'Tis here, above this precious dust,
We hymn Thee, as is just;
For by thy sepulchre this hour
We overcome death's power.
Thy resurrection stands; and thence is cast
The smile of heaven o'er future, present, past:
The past is with thy blood-wrought victory bright;
And though awhile we weep
The silence and the sleep,
Year after year, of those beyond our sight;

Digitized by Google

Yet not with drear misgivings torn
Those buried loves we mourn;
Seasons and times we count in vain,
But Thou art risen again.

Then from that truth an endless future springs,
Spiritual, real, thronged with glorious things,—
Peace, resurrection, heaven,—for all thy own:
With death we cheerly deal;
In thankful joy we kneel
Where shall be dressed so soon our turf and stone:
Jesus our Lord, the First and Last,
Thy rising-work is past;
Then present is our strength and rest,
And all our future, blest.

H. C. G. M.

Weston Super Mare, *April 13th*, 1875.

To the Editor of the *Christian Observer and Advocate.*

Dear Sir,—Being here, for a time at least, in God's providence invalided, allow me to employ some of the abundant leisure which has been thus given me in thanking you for the admirable article in your April number on "Latent Scepticism," and making an effort, however feeble, to correct it, and pointing out, as others have in former years in your most valuable periodical, with convincing ability, how little true science differs from a right understanding of the Word of God, especially in that first chapter of Genesis. For when we read there that God "in the beginning created the heaven and the earth," are we not allowed to place that beginning of all things as far back as the very wisest of philosophers or geologists demands, and take as much time, even myriads of years, for the working out of all those changes *which he says* that numberless previous convulsions have effected. For he may take as many of them as he pleases, for this period of the earth being "without form and void" and in a "state of darkness," before the Mosaic creation, when God by His Spirit "moved upon the face of the waters," to prepare the lifeless mass for better things, and to make it an abode suitable for His noblest creature, man, whom we read He created on the sixth day after. And this tells us how long God's love of men had previously existed,—while He was placing in the earth itself various minerals and the coal fields, of which he alone was to have the use, and on which he was to show forth the wondrous effects of the wisdom and the reason God gave him alone on the earth.

Digitized by Google

And this explains some other things in that wonderful record of God's working; why He so seldom uses the word created, but oftener a work like "the cooking" for which he used it in (Gen. xviii. 7),—a preparation of already existing ingredients; and in our translation (ver. 7 and 16), translated "made;" and in ver. 20 says, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly,"—*i.e.*, from already existing spawn, etc.; and ver. 25, "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind,"—*i.e.*, from previously-existing parents; while in ver. 27 we read, "So God created man in His own image."

One at least, I know, of your late most able contributors on this subject, the late Professor of Geology in the University of Oxford, has been called up higher. That others may take up the mantle, which in God's providence has fallen from him, is the object of my addressing you now. But even I can see that we need not be afraid of any blunder having been made in these words of God's truth.

Ever sincerely yours,
R. H. TRIPP, M.A. (Vicar of Alternon).

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Papal Infallibility and Ritualistic Fallibility. By the Rev. M. J. Mayers, M.A., etc. London: Hatchards. 1875.—*Beware of False Teachers. A Warning against Ritualism. By Thomas Griffith, A.M., Prebendary of St. Paul's. London: Nisbet.* 1875.—The theme upon which Mr. Mayers and Prebendary Griffith have written is one well worn. Multitudes who are roused to indignation at the extravagances of the day cannot keep silence upon it. We may however say that both these publications are timely and useful. Mr. Mayers, in a historical review, has marshalled a number of telling facts quite sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind of Papal fallibility; and without any railing accusation, has demonstrated from its own records the enormity of Papal rule. Ritualistic fallibility is an easy topic to handle, and has not required lengthened demonstration. Prebendary Griffith, with all the gravity of an aged and much venerated minister of Christ, warns against Ritualism as illegal, as Romish, and as subversive of the priesthood of Christ. He has produced a short but excellent tract, or rather treatise, well adapted for those who are in danger of being misled by false teachers. It contains in a brief compass much convincing argument, stated in a very plain and telling manner.

The Children's Pulpit. By the Rev. Gordon Calthrop, M.A. London: Hunt. 1875.—Mr. Calthrop is well known as one who possesses that most enviable gift of being able to arrest the attention of children and to enlist their sympathy in Divine things. In the

Digitized by Google

volume before us he lets us somewhat into the secret of his strength, and probably not only young people, but those to whom the charge of the young is committed, will heartily welcome the present volume. It contains a number of sermons or addresses suited to the capacity of young children of eight years of age, or even younger. Of course when read by other people they will too often lack the animation, the earnest and powerful pleading, which so remarkably distinguish the author. Much is conveyed to us all, and, perhaps, more especially to children, by a tone and by a glance, by a winning manner and affectionate sympathy which overflows in all directions. But apart from these adventitious helps the sermons are good sermons for young folk, Scriptural, sensible, plain, abounding in homely yet apt illustration, and will we doubt not be a great help to many who would fain train up their children in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, but lack the skill themselves of imparting Divine truth skilfully and intelligibly. We hope the volume will have extensive circulation.

History of the Roman Empire, A.D. 395—800. *By Arthur M. Curteis, M.A., etc. With Maps. London, Oxford, Cambridge: Rivingtons.* 1875.—The period embraced in this volume is from the death of Theodosius the Great to the coronation of Charles the Great. It is one of the series of useful historical hand-books which Messrs. Rivington are now issuing. Intended for the higher classes in public schools, they will be found serviceable by many besides as convenient works of reference, which will save time and labour in investigation; results are presented in a handy form, a matter of no small importance when leisure is so often wanting even to students in our busy days. The obscure but important period in the history of the world which Mr. Curteis has undertaken to narrate has, so far as we have had the leisure to examine the book, been carefully and judiciously handled. His account of Mohammedanism, for instance, is temperate and judicious. So too is his description of the Christian Church in the first four centuries. It is not disfigured by modern extravagances favouring Romish superstition.

The Saintly Calling. By the Rev. C. D. Bell, M.A., Rector of Cheltenham. London: Nisbet. 1875.—We have read with great pleasure and satisfaction Canon Bell's very sensible volume of sermons, and would wish to express our thanks to him for the careful manner in which he has treated the important subject which he has taken in hand. His volume is well calculated to induce serious reflection, and to promote sobriety of thought in godly persons, who might perhaps be tempted by the strange doctrines which have cropped up recently, unsettling many minds, to false and mistaken views concerning themselves and their attainments in the spiritual life. If we do not dwell more fully upon them it is because the main subject of which they treat is forming the subject of anxious discussion in our pages elsewhere. Otherwise we would not dismiss Canon Bell's volume with the general commendations which it most fully deserves, but would furnish some detailed account of the positions which he maintains, with so much ability and fidelity to the teaching of the Word of God.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE Easter recess has considerably curtailed the Parliamentary Session since the period when we last reviewed public affairs. Even, however, since the re-assembling of the Houses there has been little to chronicle of especial interest. The Budget of Sir Stafford Northcote is so far satisfactory that the income of the country has about equalled its expenditure, and that although the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been disappointed in sundry anticipations, there is no necessity for imposing new taxes of any consequence. In the Education Code further requirements have been introduced by Lord Sandon, which will, we fear, press hardly upon the managers of schools, especially in rural parishes. The fresh demands made by Government may not be in themselves unreasonable, but when the attendance of children is not compulsory, and not regular, as is the case in the agricultural districts, and while, moreover, the difficulty of procuring conscientious teachers in rural schools is so great, it seems a hard problem to solve how the increased requisitions will be met. If some premium could be held out to parents and children, as for instance, that all who passed Standard IV. could obtain a certificate, there might be a more reasonable hope that the new system would work well. There has been little else noteworthy, for the discreditable annoyance about the impostor Orton, forced upon the House, can only form subject for regret. In the House of Lords interest has chiefly centred in the Judicature Act, which has been warmly discussed, but the provisions of which have not yet become law; we therefore defer notice of them.

That interest, however, which may have been lacking in domestic affairs has been almost painfully excited by the "rumours of wars" which have been prevalent; partly arising from what has been supposed to be the menacing attitude assumed by Germany towards Belgium, and partly from an imaginary combination between the Emperor of Austria and the King of Italy adverse to Prussian dominion and legislation. For these surmises there has been probably little if any foundation; but the feverish anxiety manifested is but too ominous of the unsettled condition of the Continent. Europe is now permeated by ecclesiastical intrigue skilfully fomenting the many elements of discord agitated by the late war; whether the crushing reverses sustained by Rome and her partizans in the former defeat of France may have been sufficient to make a fresh religious war hopeless we do not venture to determine.

Digitized by Google

Statesmen might probably be anxious to avert a conflict, but will the temper of the nations, inflamed by subtle arts, admit of the prolongation of peace? Meanwhile the Emperor of Austria has met the King of Italy at Venice on terms of singular amity; and the health of the Emperor of Germany has hindered his crossing the Alps for a similar interchange of courtesies.

From Spain the news is scanty, and we fear ominous of fresh evils. Symptoms are not wanting of a retrograde policy in the important question of religious liberty. University professors tinged with Liberalism have been dismissed with harshness, and much disorder prevails. The fair dawn of King Alphonso's reign is already overcast with thick clouds.

Dr. Manning has been created a Cardinal by the Pope, a promotion which he has merited by the prostration of his intellect to the most astounding absurdity ever palmed off upon the credulity of mankind. It confers upon him perhaps in Italy, certainly within the precincts of the Vatican, the status of a Prince of the Roman Church. In England, except amongst his co-religionists, his new dignity is simply analogous to that which we remember, when Mr. Canning called a new word into existtence, was assumed by a Mr. Macgregor, who dubbed himself, or was dubbed by some Indian tribe, Cacique of Poyaís.

In India, the trial of the Guikwar of Baroda has been concluded. The judges were not unanimous as to the guilt of the Chief. The decision of the Viceroy has been that for his notorious misconduct and gross misgovernment Mulhar Rao should be deposed.

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury has met. With the usual good sense which characterizes the Upper House, there is manifest a disposition to avoid compromising themselves by fruitless expressions of opinion, which can only irritate and cannot impede the regular course of law which will in due season take its course. The Lower House has adopted resolutions about the eastward position and vestments, conceived in the spirit which usually distinguishes its deliberations. It may not only be judicious, but charitable also, to abstain from further comment.

In Ireland the Synod of the Church has been engaged chiefly with discussions upon the Athanasian Creed. While it is to be retained, as an enlarged portion of the services of the Church, what are usually termed the "damnatory" clauses are to be relegated amongst the doctrinal standards of the Church.

In a review of the month we cannot pass over without comment the evangelistic services which have been so successfully held by Messrs. Moody and Sankey, the American revivalists in London. Not disfigured by enthusiastic extrava-

Digitized by Google

gances, nor pandering to sectarian jealousies, these services have we believe, been the means of much blessing in the Metropolis, as in so many other great towns in Scotland and in England. In these days, when there are so many who would cast dishonour upon the Word of God, and who would hold the Divine ordinance of preaching in contempt, it is most satisfactory to witness that a simple proclamation of the truth as it is in Jesus, made in homely language but with unquestioning faith, can rivet tens of thousands of all ranks and classes, and lead them to concern for the salvation of their souls. Men of the highest intelligence, women of the utmost refinement, equally with the humblest and the most ignorant, have listened to the "old, old story" with devotion and delight. We hope that those who are the ambassadors of Christ will take a lesson from the American evangelists, and will learn not to darken Divine "counsel by words without knowledge." That the message of God is not more generally influential is no doubt largely attributable to the hardness and impenitence of the human heart; but perhaps often fails from the pompous rodomontade of those who undertake to deliver it.

It is satisfactory to know that chaplains will proceed with the Arctic expedition. If judiciously selected they may be the means of much blessing to many in the arduous undertaking contemplated, when for so long a period men are thrown back upon themselves; and there will be begun, as we hope also there will be, as there is so often with sailors, inclination for the study of the Bible.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limited period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the educed price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 6. JUNE. [1875.

THE ATTRACTIONS OF ERROR.

ERROR would have no attractions for perfect wisdom. There must be a measure of ignorance in any man who mistakes the false for the true. "The God of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not." And error would have no attractions for imperfect wisdom, except it had in connection with it some ingredient and element of truth.

There are, therefore, two conditions required for attraction. One is in the thing that draws,—something which gives magnetic force to influences which act upon us; the other is in the thing that is drawn,—something which disposes us to yield to the influence by reason of the condition of thought and life and feeling under which we have been brought. The angel of darkness would terrify us, and will one day torture and taunt poor souls that are for ever under his power; and so it is "as an angel of light" that the deceiver can best approach beings who may yet clean escape out of his presence and his snare.

Man, therefore, needs to cultivate two powers: the power of analysis, by which he separates the precious from the vile, and takes up the nutritive to the exclusion of the injurious in all matters set before his soul as food; and the power of diagnosis, by which he discriminates between the healthy and the unhealthy, in the cravings which he is conscious of in his own soul life, and so allows himself only to assimilate what is needful and suitable and salutary for his own soul's food.

But, for practical purposes, it may be well to deal with the question before us, not in the abstract and general form, but in relation to the circumstances and questions of our own day, and particularly of our own Church. Thereby we may arrive at some precautions which may wisely be taken, some preventives which may well be employed, and some general principles of treatment

Digitized by Google

by which we may best antagonize error, and perpetuate the truth which still makes us free.

1. There are evident attractions in Romish and kindred Ritualistic errors under which men's minds are found to yield. What is the secret of the power, and what is the explanation of the weakness, out of which these strange results have come? One is the assumption of authority. The sacerdotal system tends to invest some men with a power before which other men are required to bow. It claims a Divine commission to speak and minister, until the inspired Word is concealed behind the uninspired comment, and the Christly functions are forgotten under the priestly ceremonials. An absolute and arbitrary claim, at which the intelligent and independent mind recoils, has attraction, by its very boldness, for a mind that is more willing to trust than think. There is an assumption in the claimant which goes with some men for justice in the claim. Specially is this seen in an age when men are quibbling, quarrelling, and going asunder on every small matter of difficulty or discussion concerning faith. The man who gives no reasons, and makes no concessions, and suffers no denial and no appeal, has the semblance of having made up his own mind; and this is of itself an attraction for unstable and undecided men. Men like to be governed, if they do not feel equal to govern others or to control themselves. And the man is believed, whatever the facts may be, who continues to assert that he has always believed, and always been believed, upon some point of fact or doctrine which we do not care to examine and prove for ourselves. The Church of Rome has raised this question of authority to higher and higher position in modern days. She has grown more imperious as she has become less imperial, and increased the demands in proportion as men have found out that they cannot be justified or endured. There is something significant in this policy. It seems to say that she aims at the many who are weak, and in her influence over them she hopes one day to crush the few who are too strong to be entangled in her snares. She is for erecting a tyranny by the false, and then she will turn round and stamp out the true. Politically, morally, spiritually, intellectually, she may be wrong. What then? If she can become physically, ecclesiastically, tyranically dominant and oppressive, the victory will be all she wants, and all she means to have. A stern demand,—Accept my offer or incur my anathema, confess at my feet or be unforgiven, follow in my train or be for ever forsaken,—these things impress the imagination if they do not convince the understanding; and they carry the heart by storm, even when they act not on its love but its alarms. Now, against all this human assumption, we must assert and insist upon the authority of the inspired Word.

Digitized by Google

It may be called an old-fashioned argument and an oft-repeated reply; but error never looks so foolish, or proves so weak, as when the truth is quietly and continuously tracking her every step. Historic facts to prove the falsehood of her claims, argumentative illustrations to show up the fallacy of her conclusions, and above all direct Scriptural evidence to testify that her assumptions never were, are not, and never can be true,—these are the things for which the Christian champion, in this our day, should have the richness of a full memory, and the readiness of a fluent speech, and the ripeness of a matured wisdom, and the resolution of a distinct purpose and of a decided will. There was a time when the community was leavened with a love and a knowledge of Scripture truth. Theology was once the study of the people. We must bring back that state of things. For the nation and Church cannot be strong, and will never be safe, except in the manliness of thought and vigour of conviction which come out of an individual acceptance and advocacy of God's own word of truth.

Another element of strength in the appeal which superstition makes, is its boastful account of the multitudes over whom it rules. The prestige of a seeming success—the presence of multitudes who seem to be satisfied—have great power over minds of a certain order. And there is something imposing in a Christendom said to be modelled after the Popish type. But what are the full facts? Is the nominal allegiance anything like a real adhesion? The history of this system in all its old haunts is disruption, dismemberment, and decay. It is like an old tree in which the heart has crumbled, and the new shoots come only from the latest deposits. The institution, the organization, the machinery still are to be found over a large area; but the influence, the vitality are gone. Amongst our Protestant energies the thing has some strength, because it is imitating our ways, making skilful use of our liberties, and deceiving some of our people, who carry into their perverted faith something of the vigour which our purer creed had given them. But it is more on the prestige of a past than on the power of a present reputation that the thing lives.

Now against this element of strength we must use a double weapon. First, an example. We have too much forgotten the argument of unity. Men separate for any small offence, as if divisions were no evil. The Master made the union to be an evidence of oneness with Himself. And while we never fail to show that it is "in the dispensation of the fulness of time" that the Lord will "gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth,"—that the temple is to be put together hereafter, while the stones and timber are

Digitized by Google

prepared now where God's servants are at work; still we must let it appear that Christians love all who are Christ's, and that the saved come together, and do not stand apart, because they have all a common attraction towards Him whom they all love. In the face of the enemy we must abandon or keep down our individual preferences and minor differences on things which are not of the faith. And it should be every man's duty by his teaching and his example to stop that disintegrating and dividing action which is far too much at work in these modern days. Secondly, we must use an argument. If numbers really had authority in matters of opinion or of faith, then the heathen nations would have first claim on our attention—then popular mistakes might take place above unpalatable and unpretentious truth—then majorities would decide, and a multitude set upon doing evil would carry away in their stronger current the smaller section of those who obey God rather than men. The condition of mind also should be kept in a healthy state to deal with this drawing power of error dominant and widely spread. Men must be told, and often told, till they know and remember, what the real foundation is on which religious and saving truth must rest. The Gospel is not an invention, or an induction, but it is a revelation. It is not given according to the creature's wish, but according to the Creator's will; and the one principle of it is this, "Let God be true, and every man a liar." We must take men back to the old foundation principle of an inspired Scripture. There is no infallibility in a Pope, or in a Church, or in a communion never so large with opinions never so strong. There is infallibility only in God; and what God has said settles all in every department of doctrine, and morals, and life, and experience, and expectation. "To the law and to the testimony" is to be the direction which all true men must give in this evil day, "when evil men and seducers wax worse and worse." The real protection is, in short, "the armour of light." Let a man stand in the light of God's Word, in the light of God's countenance, in the light of God's Spirit, and the fiery darts of the wicked will fall harmlessly from heart and head. The shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit were the equipment by means of which our fathers fought and won the heights on which we all now stand, and our defence must be found in the self-same weapons of war. Superstition will find no nutriment in the mind saturated with Scriptural truth; and the boastings of authority will be no worse than Goliath's threat, which the Son of Jesse disregarded and despised, knowing that he was going forth in the name of the Most High God, the God of the armies of Israel, whom the Philistine had despised.

Digitized by Google

But error equally appears in another and opposite direction, and that also has attractions for many minds. And so we must consider the case of scepticism and unbelief.

This is the direction in which danger to the Church and to souls is specially to be feared and guarded against. It may be now, as we know it was after the Laudian attempt to push authority too far, a recoil from superstitions which reason and revelation equally repudiate. Or it may be a result of a luxurious, utilitarian, and materialistic age, in which men are so absorbed and entangled in questionable worldly pursuits, that they "love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

Or it may be because "the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their consciences seared with a hot iron."

But, explain it as we may, the fact is there, too plain to be overlooked, and too painful to be undervalued, that absolute denial or concealed dislike of the truth as it is in Jesus, has laid hold on multidudes of men, in every department of Christendom, and in every grade and condition of life. And a special attractiveness in this kind of error is found in the openness and modesty with which the investigation seems to be made. A man is asked to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." He is told that no such thing as mystery, revelation, spirituality, immortality, can fairly be submitted to the faculties which men possess for making search. He is persuaded to confine himself to things known, and to busy himself mainly with the things seen, felt, comprehended from the position in which the man is placed. True, this only withdraws from the very things which create the difficulty,—it only leaves out all the very questions which have deepest interest,—it only explains one part of man's nature, and deals with one part, and that the earliest and the shortest part, of the individual's existence. Let any man think himself into himself, and such a system gives him no assistance. Let any man give his own heart's instincts and aspirations full play, and they will go forward into regions whither the discoveries of the Positivist never pretend to enter. The error will never satisfy an awakened soul, and never comfort a dying sinner. But, for men who are content with life as it is, and the world as they have it, there is an attractiveness in a system which helps them to forget a future, and fight against painful fears which are apt to rise at times even in a successful sinner's heart.

Then there are compliments paid to human understanding, and flattering expectations formed about human investigations,

Digitized by Google

and these things please and draw. But the secrets of the soul are not explained. The complaints of the conscience, the cravings of the heart are all unmet; and a man who can be content with doubting or denying in these deeper things of his own nature and of his own future, has practically shut himself in to a narrower and lower world than that in which faith and hope and love rejoice to expatiate and expand. There is, no doubt, an attractiveness about science,—a grandeur in the search which passes from system to system in the great universe of space,—an excitement in the passage through the marvels of the handiwork of our God,—a fascination as fresh discoveries repay honest and painful toil,—a satisfaction as we step from fact to fact, all solid and distinct, along the line which science marks out for our ascent from cause to consequence. But faith has equal delight in such inquiries. Christian men welcome every scientific fact as part of that same great system of truth to which the revelation in God's Word belongs. Only amongst the material, he also looks for the immaterial. In the things which are seen he traces marks of Him who is invisible. And above and beyond the region which sense can search, he finds all expanse over which his soul can soar into the very presence of Him who "ordereth all things according to the counsel of His own will." The correction of error in this direction is to introduce the subjects which Materialistic inquiry has overlooked. Ask the man who deals with the organs what he makes of the life. Bid the investigator of the body to account for the thought. Show how between the facts of the world of matter there are interstices which demand an inquiry into spirit and the mind which directs all to great purposes for good. Show, in short, that Materialism fails a man just at the most interesting point of his advancing investigations; and that when human science has taught a man where he is, it has nothing to say as to what he is, and why he is, and where he is to be. Religion, as God has revealed it by His Spirit, supplies the facts upon this higher knowledge. They are as much facts, when God has made them known, as are any of the hard materials which man has gathered out of this earthly quarry. Religion is as much a science as astronomy. And reason has only richer material to build with, when she puts together the ascertained realities of the higher spiritual life. If investigation proves to me that there is a sun, revelation makes known to me that there is a God. If I gather from science what are the laws of health for my body, I learn none the less surely from the Gospel what are the laws of health for my soul. We grudge not, therefore, the philosopher his glorious field, for we are glad of his discoveries, and thankful for all the knowledge he brings to the surface to enlarge and enrich

Digitized by Google

our mind. But we do beg him not to ignore the fruits which we have gathered from the tree of life. We join him on his ground; but we lovingly invite him upon ours. We tell him that he knows much; but we bid him not refuse to know more, because the search is in another section of God's great universe of truth.

The error attracts because it offers to explain the easier by leaving the harder problems unexplained. And the minds that are attracted are such as are willing to run to a certain length so long as the way suits their fancy, and does not strain their lower powers. And the thing to be done in freeing the mind from the fascination of the error, is to bring out the whole questions of the whole man,—to set forth all the facts concerning the entire existence; and then put it to the inquirer's soul whether he is satisfied with the explanation of himself,—whether he is sure concerning the future of his own nature by reason of the instruction which science, apart from revelation, has been able to give him. The Materialist takes hold of man by the senses; but we must take hold of him by the conscience, by the soul, by the heart which has been made for love of better things. The sceptic keeps him down amongst the opinions, and doubts, and mistakes, and misbeliefs of men; the Christian is to lift him up into the hopes and joys and experiences which come to the creature from the fulness of the great Creator. Lift up the Lord Jesus and He will draw the mind from error. Bring out the facts of this dispensation of the Spirit, and the Holy Ghost will take of the things of Christ, and glorify both the Saviour and the saved. Tell the whole story of the coming kingdom of glory and eternal bliss, and men will wake up as out of dream, when the good hand of God has touched them, and behold life is a nobler thing, the universe is a wider home, truth has a far more glorious outlook than the sinner and sceptic had ever yet conceived.

I touch but briefly upon another error which has power over yet different minds.

The error of a present indulgence sways multitudes of coarser men. These men are found everywhere, in our congregations, in society, in every rank of life. They repeat all the articles of our creed. They respond to all the reasonableness of our appeals. They are orthodox, but unmoved. They are acquiescent, but unimpressed. Religion may be something to some, so they are prepared to admit; but at present it is not much to them. It may be at some later period, but it is not now. The attraction here is the nearness of the object to the sense that can be influenced by it. It is the coin upon the eye which shuts out vision of the sun. It is the non-conducting lamina which will

Digitized by Google

not suffer the electric influence to pass. Think of the entanglements of trade, of the excitements of ambition, of the absorptions of pleasure, of the fever of sensualities, of the burnings of envy, of the bitterness of ill-will, and you will understand what influences are everywhere and ever at work to draw men from the heavenly, and the holy, and the happy,—the atmosphere of love in which alone the finer growths of mind and heart are found. An abounding worldliness is an absorbing attraction to which multitudes of men are yielding. Thousands are neither superstitious nor sceptical; they are indifferent and unconcerned. They admit truth without accepting it; and they deny error without resisting it. They are too lukewarm ever to have an enthusiasm, and too languid ever to take up shield or spear. In handling such the enemy has only to be quiet. The worldly atmosphere has stupified them, and they will sleep on in the surfeit of sense, till they open their eyes in another world, being in torments. What are we to do with such men? We must give them no rest. Anything is better than letting them alone. The careless must be awakened; and if in our zeal we use means which the wakeful think too loud, too startling, too extreme, we point to the nearness of the pit and the stertorousness of the slumber; we tell of the policy of the devil, and we declaim about the preciousness of the thing in peril; and nothing must hold us back, so long as one poor soul abides unroused in the house where the flames are raging. The bait of worldliness is not meant for the good of him who takes it in. The mask of sin covers a hideous face, which the sinner must wed, and not love. The devil's lie is ever the contradiction of God's truth; but it is a wicked pretence when he would persuade his dupes to look for anything profitable in their knowledge of good and evil. The worldly man is staking his soul on a false issue; for if he could win the whole world, he would gain nothing that lasts, and when he loses his soul he loses all.

And we are the servants of the Lord Jesus Christ, who came to seek and to save that which was lost. We are partakers of that precious salvation which has eased our conscience, and enlarged our hearts, and elevated our hopes, and enlightened our understandings, and enlivened our labour of love. What are the very obvious inferences from a position and an opportunity such as ours? The freedmen must be the emancipators. The lovers of truth must be speakers of truth. They who dwell in the light must reflect it forwards on such as are still in darkness and the shadow of death. They who have been taken into the ship must be busy in rescuing such as are still struggling in the waters of sin and death.

It is a time for conference. Well may men come together.

Digitized by Google

But what if men only meet, and go apart again without any knitting together of soul, and any uniting together for any common purpose or for any concurrent work? Then we shall have looked at the errors, and feared to face them. We shall have seen the fallen brother, and have passed by on the other side. Our opportunity is our responsibility. Let us come to some such conclusions as these.

The error is from the Evil One, and in all our thoughts and labours we must have distinctly in mind that we resist the devil. His personality, his power, his cunning, his continuous effort, must be things seen, known, felt, antagonized, in every effort we make over the souls of men.

The truth is from the Holy One,—and after all our arguments, and appeals, and efforts, and example, we must keep the Master's hand in mind. "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," should be on the lips of any man who goes into the stronghold of Satan, to set poor sinners free.

The fight is life-long, but the life of holy fighting is but short, and so we must gather up our whole strength in every blow, and throw our whole soul into every struggle, for never was it more needed than now that the Christian motto is, "Whatsoever thine hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."

But the fierceness of the enemy's attack may tell that his time is short. He is mustering many forces for his last attack. He may bring out unheard of appliances of war, or propound subtle terms of peace, so "that, if it were possible, he would deceive the very elect." "Let no man's heart fail because of him." "The Faithful and True" has made His white horse ready for victory. Even already the big drops have fallen here and there, and the garden of the Lord has some bright green spots on which precious plants of grace are maturing some riper seeds of holiness than the Church has seen of late. The pentecostal blessing began, and Joel's old words were true, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh;" but the days of our dispensation will close with yet richer grace, and the closing words of the prophet will have a grand fulfilment in the latter times: "On my servants and on my handmaids I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." Look, brethren, for yet larger things from God; wait more, and yet at shorter intervals on God; watch more, and with still nearer yearnings for God; and so you will find the Holy Ghost going out with the heavenly light, up and down amongst the Churches and throughout the world; and then, in the presence of the true and under the power of the Truth-Teacher, errors will lose their attractions, and folly will relinquish her hold, and the reign of light and love and liberty

Digitized by Google

will spread over all the redeemed; and the city shall have "no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it: for the glory of God shall lighten it, and the Lamb will be the light thereof." JOHN RICHARDSON.

FASTING COMMUNION.

Fasting Communion, Non-Communicating Attendance, etc., etc. By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.C.L., D.D, Dean of Norwich. London: Rivingtons. 1874.

Fasting Communion Historically Investigated from the Canons and Fathers, and shown to be not binding in England. By the Rev. Hollingworth Tully Kingdon, M.A., Assistant-Curate, St. Andrew's, Wells Street; late Vice-Principal of Salisbury Theological College. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1875.

THE subject of Fasting Communion is one which, to the majority of our readers, will appear to demand but little time for its consideration. To the mind of the simple Bible reader the whole question is disposed of in the few but conclusive words of the Evangelists, in their record of the original institution of the Lord's Supper: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread," etc. (Matt. xxvi. 26); and again: "Likewise also the cup after Supper," etc. (Luke xxii. 20.) Inasmuch however, in this, as in other matters, our modern Ritualists prefer the vain traditions of men to the plain and obvious meaning of the Word of God, and inasmuch as they have succeeded in instilling their erroneous notions into the minds of many young and susceptible persons, we think that Dean Goulburn and Mr. Kingdon have done well in directing attention to this subject, and in exposing the fallacy of the grounds upon which the alleged obligation of Fasting Communion rests.

Now we believe that, although the number of such rash interpreters is but small, and, we need hardly add, their learning and judgment entitled to little consideration, there are some who have ventured to enlist Holy Scripture itself so far on their side as to deny that it affords direct sanction for a practice contrary to that which they would enforce.

Inasmuch then as we are prepared to stake the whole question on a simple appeal to the law and to the testimony, we think it desirable to make brief reference to the direct sanction of Holy Scripture in support of the lawfulness of the reception of the Lord's Supper after partaking of ordinary food.

We shall not now enter into any lengthened inquiry as to the custom of the Jews, whether in ancient or in modern times,

Digitized by Google

regarding the partaking of food on the day of the Passover. Such inquiry appears to us to be irrelevant to the real question in dispute, inasmuch as (1) we deny that there is any conclusive proof that the Jewish Paschal Feast was celebrated by our Lord and His Apostles before the institution of the Lord's Supper; and (2) we maintain that if it was, the inference is altogether in favour of participation in the Communion after food, and not, as alleged by Dr. Littledale, against it. It will suffice, then, to observe that the Divine prohibition in regard to the preparation for that feast extends only to the putting away of leaven; while, as regards the traditional exposition of the law, it extends only to the putting away of everything which has come into contact with leaven during the preceding year. As regards the previous use of food, we find no injunction at all in Scripture; but there is a custom which prevails amongst the Jews, that there should be a general abstinence from food for a sufficient length of time to enable them to partake with some amount of appetite of the unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and that the firstborn should fast throughout the day of preparation. The institution of the Lord's Supper by the Divine Founder of Christianity was, as the Gospels expressly declare, in direct conjunction with the celebration of a *feast*, whether the Paschal Feast, properly so called, or an anticipation of it. The bread, as we have already observed, was taken and distributed, *as the disciples were eating*, and the cup was delivered to them *after* they had supped. Against facts so plain and so unequivocal, the sophistry of a ritualism which attempts to tamper with such evidence must, in the judgment of every candid and unprejudiced mind, not only fail to produce its designed effect, but recoil upon the heads of those who have had recourse to it.

But the evidence derived from the original institution of the Lord's Supper does not stand alone. If the reference in Acts ii. 46 be, as many suppose, to the reception of the Lord's Supper,—a point on which we forbear to enter,—the words which immediately follow, "they did eat their meat with gladness," are not calculated to suggest the idea of fasting Communion. The evidence from Acts xx. is more direct. We read in that chapter that on the first day of the week "the disciples came together to break bread;" and, inasmuch as St. Paul's speech "continued until midnight," it is but reasonable to suppose,—whatever our estimate of the length of the Apostle's discourse,—that the assembly must have been convened in the latter part of the day. We are of course aware of the Ritualistic gloss that the Communion which followed was a fasting Communion, inasmuch as it was not celebrated until after midnight; and Mr. Kingdon refers to a case in which a sick person, having long abstained

Digitized by Google

from communion because of the necessity of a frequent participation of food, actually "persuaded a priest to celebrate at a quarter before one in the morning."[a] We should deem it an insult to the understanding of our readers were we to enter upon any lengthened refutation of so obvious a perversion of the plain import of the words of the narrative as that which represents this *alleged* fast as intentional; and we content ourselves with the simple observation, that the only natural inference to be drawn from the words of St. Luke is, that it was the custom of the disciples at Troas to assemble on the first day of the week for the purpose of "breaking bread," and that the hour at which they assembled for that purpose on the occasion in question was an *evening* hour.

Our space will not admit of a careful examination of the important directions given by St. Paul respecting the celebration of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. xi. We must content ourselves with the observation that the obvious inference as to the time of the celebration in this case, as in that of the Christians at Troas, is, that it was at evening, the hour when the ordinary "supper" or evening meal was taken; and that amongst the points of rebuke selected by St. Paul, we find no condemnation either of the hour chosen for the celebration, or of the previous participation of ordinary food.[b]

It is but due, however, to the measure of common sense which exists even amongst the majority of the most advanced Ritualists that we should observe that their chief arguments in support of fasting Communion are not derived from Holy Scripture. The three arguments to which Mr. Kingdon refers

---

[a] P. 2, foot-note.

[b] The evidence afforded by 1 Cor. xi. that the Agapè preceded the Lord's Supper, or that the two were observed at the same time, appears to us to be too clear to admit of doubt. Chrysostom, however, appears to have adopted a different view, and Mr. Kingdon inclines to the opinion that in primitive times every meal that was "differentially Christian *commenced* with the Eucharist." It will suffice, however, so far as our present argument is concerned, to observe that, as a remedy against the abuses into which the Church of Corinth had fallen, St. Paul recommends the hungry to satisfy the cravings of appetite at home, before joining his brethren either in the celebration of the Agapè or of the Lord's Supper. (v. 34.) "Put in common words," says Dean Goulburn (p. 8), "his rule is, 'I forbid your making the Supper of the Lord a meal. If you really need a meal, you can take it in the house before you come to church.'" We may note, in this place, our entire dissent from the opinion expressed by Mr. Kingdon, that the words "breaking bread from house to house" (Acts ii. 46), even if we admitted the translation, justify the inference that the Apostles, "as the only men capable of consecrating the elements, went from house to house to consecrate, and thus bless the food;" and again from the further opinion expressed by him, that it is impossible to suppose in St. Luke's account of St. Paul's blessing and eating, previously to the shipwreck, that he is not affirming "that this was a consecration of the Eucharist." (p. 207.)

Digitized by Google

are these: (1) greater reverence to the Sacrament; (2) the obligation of the Canons of the Church; and (3) the assimilation of our rule to that of other Churches. We purpose to say a few words on each of these three heads.

In regard to the alleged greater reverence displayed to the Institution of the Lord's Supper, we must confess to an *a priori* objection to any arguments which are calculated to inspire doubt respecting the prescience or the wisdom of the Divine Founder of our religion. We are now dealing solely with the question in the abstract, and we assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that any allegation to the effect that greater reverence is shown to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper by observing it at a different time from that at which it was instituted, and in a different manner from that in which it was observed in the upper room at Jerusalem, seems to imply that the institutions of Christ are capable of being amended by the wisdom and observation of man. But without further insisting on this point, we proceed to inquire what is the real nature of that reverence for Divine institutions which alone is acceptable to God. If it be true that whilst man looks "on the outward appearance," the Lord "looketh on the heart," it will follow that the truest reverence for Divine ordinances consists in observing them in that manner in which they are productive of the greatest amount of benefit to the souls of the worshippers. On this subject we quote with satisfaction the following words of Mr. Kingdon:—

"It is clear that if our service of God is to be rational and spiritual, and not merely bodily and external, then reverence of reason and spirit must be of more importance than mere reverence of body, unless there is some definite command of God or man compelling the conscience to the contrary. Now all who are worthy of attention agree that there is no Divine command binding the conscience to fasting Communion; almost all agree that there is a Divine command to receive Communion; and all must agree that there is a Divine command to worship God in spirit and in truth. It follows that recollectedness of mind and devout reverence of spirit must be of more importance than accidental disposition of body." (Int., pp. 4, 5.)

If these principles be recognised, it follows that the question of fasting or non-fasting Communion is one which depends upon the constitution, habits, and circumstances of each individual communicant. If the hour of celebration be an early hour, and those who are able to attend at that hour find that their minds are more clear and collected before than after the participation of a meal, none can object to such fasting Communion; and, so far as it may be found practicable, we entirely concur in the wish expressed by Dean Goulburn, that the

Digitized by Google

feelings and wishes of such persons should be consulted in the arrangement of our services. If, on the contrary, it be found that entire abstinence, so far from tending to qualify the communicant for a more devout and more profitable participation in the service, distracts the thoughts by constraining them to revert to the infirmities of the body rather than to the higher desires and aspirations of the soul, then we affirm our conviction that such fasting Communion, being altogether an ordinance of man, becomes a snare and a hindrance, rather than an aid, to true devotion.

We will now proceed to notice the second plea for fasting Communion: viz., the alleged obligation of the Canons of the Church.

And here we would remind our readers, in the first place, that this is an argument which consistent members of the Church of England will use with much caution. Let us grant, for the sake of argument, that this was one of those points on which the Canons of the ancient Church were unanimous. The question would still remain,—What authority those Canons possess for us? On all matters such as these, the English Church claims her own indefeasible right to furnish rules for the observance of her own members, subject to one—and one only—condition: viz., that nothing be ordained "that is contrary to God's Word written." Now it is notorious that the English Church, as Dean Goulburn has showed, is "absolutely silent" on this subject. We may search in vain throughout the whole of our Communion Office, and of our Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and of the Canons and Constitutions of 1604, for a single word, or even hint, respecting fasting Communion. Nay more, if we refer to the Homily on "the subject of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,"—a Homily in which, if anywhere, the mind of the English Church would be likely to find its expression, we still find not so much as a single hint dropped on the obligation, or the expediency of fasting Communion. It follows, then, that if authority is to be found for this practice, it must be sought outside the Formularies of the English Church, as *e.g.*, in the Canons of the ancient Church, and in the opinions of Divines and theologians, whether ancient or modern, whether foreign or English.

Now it it somewhat remarkable, as it has been observed by Dean Goulburn, that among the Acts of the Six General Councils, to which reference is made in the Statute of 1 Elizabeth, no rule on the subject of fasting Communion is found. We should be very far, indeed, from admitting its obligation had the contrary been the case, inasmuch as independently of the larger question respecting the fallibility of General Councils, and the actual errors into which they have fallen, we agree with Dean

Digitized by Google

Goulburn and with Mr. Kingdon in drawing a wide distinction between questions of faith and questions of dicipline. On this point, whilst by no means committing ourselves unreservedly to Mr. Kingdon's views on the subject of ecclesiastical authority, we think that his general argument is entitled to much weight. At the first Council at Jerusalem, held probably about the year 53 A.D., the question of the lawfulness of eating meats offered in sacrifice to idols had been determined in the negative, in an assembly concerning whose decrees it is written, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." (Acts xv. 28.) And yet in two epistles, both of them probably written within about seven years after the Council of Jerusalem was held, and written, moreover, by an Apostle who had himself been present at and assisted in its deliberations, we find no reference made in the rules which he lays down for the observance of the Churches of Rome and of Corinth to the decrees of that Council; but we find the question respecting the eating or not eating of meat which had been offered in sacrifice to idols determined by reference to the law of conscience and of Christian charity.[c]

If then positive Divine law admits of change, as we learn both from the Old and New Testament, much more does positive human law allow of change in accordance with change of external circumstances of time and of place. Another qualification as regards the acceptance of the Canons of earlier times is the necessity that such Canons should be promulgated and accepted by particular Churches. Without such promulgation and acceptance, on the highest ecclesiastical principles, the Canons of Carthage or of Constance are absolutely nothing to the Church of England; and, further, in regard to Canons of discipline, they must not only be published before they can acquire force, but they must continue to be published in order that they may retain it. And, once more, it is obvious to the meanest capacity that we have no right to apply a purely eclectic process to the decrees of any of the Councils, whether of earlier or of later date. Either we must recognise their obligation generally, except where decisive reasons can be alleged for their rejection, or we must abstain from appealing to them as affording any conclusion, or even strong ground in favour of the adoption or rejection of any particular rite or ceremony. If, for example, we refer to the decrees of the Council of Mâcon (585 A.D.) in support of fasting previously to the reception of the Communion, at other times, we must, if we would not be guilty of inconsistency, justify, on the same authority, the reception of the Communion, after and even on the authority of the First

[c] See Rom. xiv. 14, 15; and 1 Cor. x. 27—30.

Digitized by Google

Council of Braga (563 A.D.) on Maunday Thursday, anathematize those who communicate on that day before three o'clock in the afternoon. If, again, on the authority of the Council of Auxerre (578 A.D.), and of the Anglo-Saxon Canon of 994 A.D., we enjoin the general necessity of fasting Communion, we must, on the same grounds, forbid any to be *present in church* during the celebration who have previously broken their fast, and we must even forbid them to taste food on Sunday until after hearing the sermon at noon-day; and we must, on equally valid grounds, enforce the fast which *followed* as well as that which preceded the reception of the elements.

It would be altogether superfluous, in our judgment, were we to enter at any length on a review of the nature of the evidence in favour of fasting Communion derived from the Canons of the Mediæval Church, or even from those of a more remote date. The injunction to communicate fasting appears to have originated about the end of the fourth century; and those who are acquainted with the habits of the people on whom the injunction was laid, and also with the meaning which was then attached to the word "fast," will be disposed to inquire why an entire abstinence from the Holy Communion was not prescribed rather than why moderation in food and in drink was thus earnestly and stringently enjoined.[d] We think that Mr. Kingdon has done good service in directing the attention of his readers to the utter diversity of the circumstances and habits of the people on whom fasting Communion was enjoined, from those of professed Christians in the present day. At a time when the work of the day began many hours sooner than it does now, when wine was the common beverage which accompanied the morning meal, when the habit of eating and drinking to excess at that hour was the characteristic practice even of professedly Christian communities, we are disposed to censure rather the too great leniency than the supposed asceticism of those who prescribed moderation and who imposed restrictions. When we remember, moreover, that the moderation enjoined extended not to the administration or reception of the Holy Communion only, but also to other ecclesiastical offices, and when we remember also that the fast commonly enjoined was not a total abstinence from food or drink, but an abstinence from the heavy and inflaming

[d] Mr. Kingdon has an interesting section on the meaning of the word *jejunus, fasting*, in which he shows that a technical meaning unknown to early Christian writers has been attached to this word. He illustrates his argument by reference to the Greek word ἄσιτοι (Acts xxvii. 33), which is rendered in the Authorised Version *fasting*, and observes that the word cannot be understood in this place in the sense of having taken no food at all, inasmuch as independently of a miraculous intervention, of which there it no intimation, the prolongation of life for fourteen days would have been physically impossible.

Digitized by Google

meals which disqualified those who partook of them from any service which was of a spiritual or even of a rational character, we shall feel that it is not without ground that Mr. Kingdon arrives at the conclusion that the injunctions of the early and of the Mediæval Church respecting fasting Communion are altogether inapplicable to the altered condition of things amongst ourselves.

We shall follow Mr. Kingdon's example in abstaining from entering at any length on the third of the reasons which may be alleged in behalf of fasting Communion: viz., a desire to approximate the usage of the English Church to that of the Roman or the Eastern Churches. For our own part, whilst we entirely repudiate the necessity or the expediency of rejecting any observances already received, on the ground that those observances are common to ourselves and to those from whom we differ, so, on the other hand, we see no ground whatever for the *assimilation* of the rites of our own Church to those of Churches which have grievously erred from the faith, and which have corrupted the simplicity of Christ's Gospel. Rather, we think the lesson which is taught us by all that is now passing around us is, to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and not to entangle ourselves, either directly or indirectly, with any yoke of bondage. To abandon our existing customs and ceremonies, on the ground that they are adopted by fallen Churches, appears to us a policy fraught with much peril. Not less perilous,—rather, under existing circumstances, much more perilous would it be to depart from our own established usages, on the ground that those usages erect a barrier between us and those Churches which have overlaid the simplicity of Christ's Gospel, by the vain and corrupt traditions of men.

We must hasten on to note some of the evils directly or indirectly connected with the inculcation of the virtue or the necessity of fasting Communion; and here we may observe that one of the first and almost necessary results of the adoption of this view is, the encouragement of non-communicating attendance. On this subject the words of Dean Goulburn are, in our judgment, words spoken in season. There are, indeed, cases in which the presence of non-communicants during the time of administration may be necessary, in order to the attendance of communicants; and it is quite possible that in some very exceptional cases it may be justifiable when not necessary. But to enjoin or to encourage the practice of non-communicating attendance as an "act of devotion having a quasi-sacramental efficacy," as though the benefits of the Lord's Supper were imparted in any other way than by actual participation, *when such participation is not only practicable, but is wilfully and designedly rejected by those who are present at the time of celebration*, is, in our judgment, a

Digitized by Google

perilous violation of a Divine ordinance, and one which is fraught with great and increasing dangers.

"'The idea,' says Dean Goulburn, 'that the Lord Himself becomes, after and in virtue of the consecration of the elements, externally present in the Church, quite apart from His reception by the penitent and believing communicant, and quite independently of any action of the human mind whereby His presence is recognised, —this idea lays the mind under a certain spell, which is found to make worship easier, and to excite a sort of reverence which seems to faint and flag as soon as Christ is thought of rather in connection with the minds of His people than with the place in which they are gathered together. But what if the idea be an effect of the imagination, and will not endure the scrutiny of Holy Scripture and reason? and what if the reverence founded upon it be a fallen and factitious reverence?'" (p. 25.)

Dean Goulburn proceeds to compare such practical disregard of the words of Christ's institution to the conduct of a man who binds his Bible in the most costly manner, and gives it the highest place in his library, and keeps it scrupulously free from dust and soil, but who never reads it; and he asks very justly and reasonably whether any can be safe and right, however well-intentioned, who "persist in putting God's gifts to uses for which it does not appear that God intended them."

The root of this perversion of a Divine ordinance lies, it cannot be denied, in the unscriptural and irrational invention of men respecting the objective presence of Christ in the elements, and the efficacy to be derived from the alleged perpetuation of a sacrifice which Scripture and our own Church represent as having been offered once for all, and as incapable of being offered again without a renewal of the sufferings of the Divine Victim.

The mind of the English Church upon this subject was expressed in very forcible language in the Prayer Books of 1552 A.D, 1559 A.D., and 1604 A.D.; and it was only because the practice of non-communicating attendance appears to have been discontinued that we find the reproof previously addressed to those who were "gazers and lookers-on," instead of being communicants, withdrawn from the Prayer-book of 1662 A.D. Some idea of the practical results of the encouragement of non-communicating attendance at the administration of the Holy Communion may be gathered from the actual condition of things in the majority of Romish Churches on the Continent, which is elucidated by Mr. Kingdon in the following extract:—

"A few years ago a Jesuit Father, English by birth and education, was conducting a retreat for priests in the North of France. One day, at the time of recreation, the parish priest called on his brethren to sympathise with him in his satisfaction at having that day communicated *two men*. The English priest was astonished.

Digitized by Google

'What! only two?' And the answer was, 'I have never seen such a sight before during the twenty years that I have been here as Curé.'" (Int. p. 1.)

Our readers will naturally expect that we should say a few words on the bearing of the questions discussed in this paper on the subject of evening Communions,—a subject which, of late years, has become invested with more than ordinary importance, in proportion as it has been adopted more largely in various Dioceses within the English Church. So far as regards the strict question of the canonical hours, it cannot be denied that the administration of the Communion after a service beginning at eleven o'clock, and continued till two o'clock or even later, is as much a departure from the practice of the pre-Reformation and the mediæval times as is the administration after a service beginning at six or seven o'clock; whilst in behalf of the latter usage it may fairly be urged that it approximates more nearly to that of the truly Primitive Church. For our own part, we think that this is pre-eminently one of those points on which it would be impossible to prescribe any rule which would be universally applicable. It is well-known that Chrysostom, when accused of having administered the Communion to people after they had eaten, whilst repudiating in the strongest terms the truth of the accusation, appealed to the example of our Lord and of His Apostles, as a justification of the act had it been committed. It must be remembered also by those who appeal to his authority that he vindicates himself in a somewhat similar strain from the charge of having administered the Sacrament of Baptism when he himself was not fasting.

As far as relates to the question of the hour of administration, it appears to us that it ought to be determined by reference to the habits and occupations of the parishioners in each particular case; and further, that whilst provision should be made generally with a view to the requirements of the largest number, and more especially for those whose time is not at their own disposal, such arrangements should be made as to enable all to yield obedience to the solemn and express command of their Lord: "Do this in remembrance of Me." It will readily be admitted that those hours should be set apart for the public worship of God generally, and more especially for this peculiarly solemn and impressive portion of that worship, at which the minds of the worshippers are most free from distraction of every kind. We believe that in this respect there is a wide difference, in accordance with the habits and temperaments of different individuals; so that whilst some find their minds most unclouded in the early hours of morning, others feel more free from physical infirmity and distraction in the evening. We believe, then, that

Digitized by Google

the true policy to be adopted by the rulers of our Church, and by the clergy generally, is to act in accordance with the injunction of the Apostle, "Let all things be done to edifying;" whilst in regard to our judgment respecting the conduct of others, in this as in many other matters of similar indifference, we believe that the same Apostle has supplied us with an unerring rule, in the direction given to the Roman Church: "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not: and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him."

MR. KINGLAKE'S BATTLE OF INKERMAN.

The Invasion of the Crimea: its Origin, and an Account of its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan. By A. W. Kinglake. Vol. v.—The Battle of Inkerman. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons. 1875.

Mr. Kinglake's latest volume, happily not his last, chronicling the Battle of Inkerman, unfolds some of the most brilliant pages in the most brilliant annals of British military renown. It is a record of heroism, unflinching and unsparing, from end to end, which all will admire; but it is at the same time a record red with the blood of our fellow-men, and filled to the full with the manifold miseries of war, and with all the havoc and all the horror of the ghastly battle-field; a record we cannot read without sorrow and sympathy, and without a clearer insight into the wise choice of King David, who preferred to fall into the hand of his God by pestilence or famine, rather than into the hand of man by the appalling scourge of war. Much, however, as there is to condemn and abhor in all warfare, however just and justifiable it may be in its motives, there still breathes in it a spirit of fascination, which is one of the darkest mysteries of an ethical being. In all nations, civilized and uncivilized, Christian and heathen, the passion for war dominates: nor did this fierce and fiery passion burn the less ardently in the breasts of the God-fearing soldiers of Cromwell, and William Prince of Orange, than in the breasts of cursing cavaliers and demoralized Papists. From the dark day when the flaming cherubim at the gates of Eden guarded our lost Paradise with the sword, down to the present, the sword has played a most prominent part in the great drama of man's earthly destiny, and exercised a marvellous fascination upon the whole race. It is on the successful warrior that a grateful country has always showered its highest honours in life, and to him in death she has raised her noblest monuments. No poetry has risen to a sublimer pitch, no music has thrilled the heart of man with such emotion, as that which sings

Digitized by Google

of the shock of battle and the glory gained on the foughten field. The epics of Tasso, of Homer, and of Virgil were almost silent voices if divorced from the martial music which inspires them, and without the roar of battle which rings throughout them, and even the "Paradise Lost" of Milton, the greatest of English epics, seldom stirs our souls to their very depths so fully as when it sings of the conflicts between the fallen and the unfallen angels upon the plains of heaven, and the humiliation of Satan, stricken down beneath the triumphant sword of the Archangel Michael.

It is this passionate interest in war, interwoven as it is in all the closest tissues of our being, which has brightened the dullest pages of Thucydides, and Livy, and Tacitus, and breathed an immortal life into their records of Greek and Roman warfare. Nor can we at all doubt but the same enduring interest in war will make the classic record of the Crimean war now before us, as enduring as the master-pieces of Greek and Roman military history,—to live as they have lived, after our language has ceased to live as a spoken language, and our race has run its destined course as a mighty nation.

Mr. Kinglake's narrative of the Crimean war, and more especially of the eventful episode of the Inkerman battle, combines the picturesque power of a Livy, with the critical insight of a Tacitus, and the truth-loving and truth-telling spirit of a Thucydides. It reads, we admit, in many passages more like a romance than a history; but if it did not so read it would not be true to the facts of the case, for in modern history a more romantic battle was never fought than Inkerman: made up as it was of unexpected turns, of startling surprises, of marvels almost incredible; filled as it was with sudden rebounds from what seemed utter annihilation; filled, too, with the spirit of adventure, pushed to the furtherest limit of heroism,—with personal self-sacrifice and personal devotion on the very sublimest scale, with the very rapture of patriotic martyrdom, with many memorable contests of generosity, and many a triumph glorified by mercy, even when the very atmosphere in which the combatants moved and breathed was one vast chaos of murderous and maddening passions.

Every page of Mr. Kinglake's description of this soul-stirring battle, goes to prove that the battle was fought by the British and won by them in sheer scorn of tactics, or open contempt for strategy. Our Generals, from first to last were surpassed and over-matched by the superior strategy of the Russian Generals, and we escaped annihilation, and snatched a costly victory by the mere pluck and heroism of our soldiers, and the matchless chivalry of our officers. Though the blundering handling of our army in the midst of the fight, gives considerable colour to the

Digitized by Google

sarcasm which represents our troops as "an army of lions led on by jackasses," yet there never was a battle fought by British troops, in which the British officer more signally and successfully displayed a greater presence of mind, more unflinching fortitude, more self-sacrificing heroism, and all this in the face of overwhelming odds, than in the brilliant series of single combats and individual struggles, which read like the battle scenes of the Iliad, chief fighting with chief, and man with man, in the wild and disordered array of battle, when rank was broken from rank, and regiment from regiment.

The great battle was prefaced only a few days before by the successful engagement of the Lesser Inkerman, in which General De Lacy Evans drove back in utter discomfiture a force under Federoff, which Mr. Kinglake regards as a reconnoissance in force of the predestined battle-ground for which the Russians were then making their final preparations. It is singular that the tactics whereby De Lacy Evans won this victory of the first Inkerman, were reversed in the second battle of Inkerman, when they were the more needed by the necessities of the case. That prudent General refused all overtures made to him to strengthen his pickets, who were falling back from the onset of the enemy. By this means he lured the Russians within the range of his artillery, and then opening a murderous fire on their gathered columns, swept them clear of the plateau, leaving but a broken and disabled handful of fugitives behind, thus securing his position, and saving his own troops.

"The General's plan," well remarks our author, "of suffering the combat to approach his own chosen ground, and then ending it at once with artillery, proved apt for the occasion in hand; but the immediate success of his tactics was not their only result. By refusing to engage out on front more than three or four hundred of his infantry, he gave to this small portion of his division—and through them to the rest of it—an hour of the most wholesome training that any good troops could well have. The few left to strive with the many discovered, and discovered with glee, that against extravagant odds they could stand combating Russian infantry for an indefinite time, losing ground indeed, little by little, when coerced by turning movements, but suffering no ruinous carnage, and not having one man taken prisoner. From the success of such an experiment, even if it had been carried no further, they could hardly have failed to acquire a strong sense of their relative power; but this lesson of course impressed them more forcibly still when they saw that their interesting and even amusing strife against numbers was crowned all at once with a victory. In reality, as we know, Evans so drew advantage from the valour of the pickets, and the sure quality of all his infantry, that he soon became the master of the combat, and determined its issue at

Digitized by Google

exactly the time he judged best by his use of the artillery arm; but this was a truth hardly evident to the English foot-soldier engaged out in front with the enemy. He of course heard the roar of the cannon, and with more or less certainty knew that flights of round-shot and shell were passing over his head, but still he looked chiefly, as was natural, to his own particular antagonists; and when, after a lengthened struggle, maintained at huge odds, he found the hostile crowd at length receding before him, and began to advance in pursuit, he imagined that the result must be owing entirely to the inferior quality of the Russian troops. He accordingly came back from the chase with a feeling of contempt for his adversaries which, however unjust, became rooted nevertheless in his mind; and the day was at hand, when to the soldiers of our 2d Division, with howling throngs of Russians before them, this consciousness of a decisive ascendant might be as the faith that lifts mountains."

It is clear, as we have already intimated, that the battle of Inkerman was a surprise, and the Russians fairly caught us napping when "a Russian General had quietly laid his unresisted hand upon nearly one half of Mount Inkerman," our very strongest position in the Crimea, before one sentinel and picket had even dreamed of an enemy in force being within arm's length. The dense and overhanging mist of that eventful Inkerman Sunday has been spread by the hands of charity over the sins of omission of our commanders; but mist or no mist, such a surprise, utterly unprecedented in the annals of modern warfare, could never have happened had the advice of Colonel Herbert been followed, when he repeatedly requested that the videttes should be thrown forward on the heights of the debatable ground, and that the chain of pickets might be looped forward in such a manner as "to secure the maintenance of an effective watch on the western and north-western shores." He had been always answered that this could not be done without either employing more forces than could be well spared for the purpose, or else incurring the risk of having men surrounded and taken.

The regular approaches of the allies before Sebastopol, which threatened early in November to force the great Russian fortress by a grand combined attack, did not escape the vigilant eye of Colonel de Todleben, "the ablest soldier of the Czar." On *Sunday, Nov.* 5th, General Canrobert and Lord Raglan were to have met to arrange the plan for a combined immediate attack. Their purpose was anticipated by the Russians, who determined to counteract the attack by a battle, with 120,000 men, against the allies, who amounted to about only half their number. The Russian plan of the battle was this: Prince Gortchakoff was to hold the ground on the banks of the Tchernaya, not far from the

Digitized by Google

Inkerman ruins, with 22,000 of horse, foot, and artillery, and no less than 88 guns. At some distance from Prince Gortchakoff's right General Dannenberg was to occupy the commanding height of Mount Inkerman with 40,000 men and 135 guns, supported by the fire of two ships in the roadstead. Within the lines of Sebastopol itself General Moller commanded about 40,000 men, ready to support the aggressive undertaking of the troops outside. The great inferiority of numbers on our side was rendered still more formidable and perilous by the peculiarity of our position. The Sebastopol lines of defence had a front of nearly four miles; but the belt of ground covered by the allies was a line of nearly twenty miles long, and this necessarily a thin weak line, and especially weak on Mount Inkerman, where 3,000 men under General Cathcart defended the most precious and the most vital of all the Allied positions, the loss of which would have been the inevitable loss of the Allied army and the abandonment of the Crimea.

"So soon as the victorious Dannenberg should have not only driven the English from Mount Inkerman, but rolled up their line further south, Prince Gortchakoff was to ascend unopposed by the approaches thus happily opened for him, and bring his 22,000 men to receive a glad welcome on the heights from Dannenberg's conquering host. That done, the enemy would be on the Chersonese with an army—even after some losses—of about 60,000 men, including a great body of cavalry. He trusted that before the sunset of the appointed day he would be already entrenching his victorious troops upon the conquered ground, and was not indeed without hope that by that time he might find himself master over all the eastern part of the Chersonese. He judged, and judged soundly enough, that his field-army thus firmly established on the toplands and having its right in close contact with the army of Sebastopol, would not merely forbid the intended assault of the Flagstaff Bastion, but, perhaps, at once force the Allies to abandon the siege; and the stress of such fortune, he knew, might well make it hard for the French and the English commanders to avert an overwhelming disaster."

So confident were the Russians in the assured success of their attack on the allies, that the two Imperial Princes, the Grand Duke Michael and the Grand Duke Nicholas, arrived specially from the Imperial Court on the Inkerman Saturday to share the peril and the glory of the coming battle. Their presence was a spell of no ordinary power on the minds of the Russian soldiery, who look upon the Royal race of their country as semi-Divine. Religion and loyalty combined to lift the passions of the Russian soldiers to the summits of the most enthusiastic devotion.

"Religion too called men to battle. The vast empire of the

Digitized by Google

Czar, as we have before seen, was so circumstanced in regard to creed, that commensurate with its sense of being a nation was its sense also of being a Church; and sacred, most sacred was the task which, on this chosen Sunday, the Czar would be intrusting to his soldiery; for he had launched them in a war to the knife against the invaders of his empire, the enemies of the Orthodox Faith, the despoilers of churches, the disciples, the abettors of Islam, and therefore (in the apprehension of simple men) the open foes of the Cross. Now at last—O holy Saint Vladimir!—that appalling sacrilege which horror-struck men on the ramparts had seen with their own eyes would be surely avenged. So great was the value attached by men in authority to the force of a religious incentive, that, even at the risk of putting their adversaries on the alert, they, so early as four in the morning, called people to mass and to battle by the clangour of the bells in their churches; and it was with a soldiery consecrated for battle that Soimonoff before break of day would march out from the Karabel Faubourg. Pauloff's troops, as we know, lay on heights beyond the Tchernaya, but their spiritual guides were in camp, and with power scarce lessened by the want of any sacred appliances; for customarily, even in cities, the utterances of the Eastern Church are delivered in the roar of strong priests without aid from the wailing of organs. When men heard the Sebastopol bells, the head of this column of Pauloff's was already some way on its march."

The first intelligence of the attack on our lines came to the ears of General Codrington, who, on taking his usual morning ride to the front about an hour before sunrise, heard the firing of a musket on his right front. The firing, very slight at the first, increased so rapidly and became so well sustained that its significance was presently clear. The General, feeling certain that an attack had begun, arrested the homeward march of the relieved pickets, sent one of his companies to reinforce the Lancaster battery, disposed the other three companies on the eastern slope of the ridge fronting Inkerman, and then galloping back into camp, put all his troops under arms. Intelligence of this sudden onset was rapidly carried to Lord Raglan, the Commander-in-Chief, and before many minutes he was in the saddle. With the true instinct of a born General, the Commander-in-Chief divined at once that the terrible blow was about to descend on Mount Inkerman, and accordingly he rode thither, and after rapidly providing that the ground in front of the English left and centre should be watched by Sir Richard England, he ordered reinforcements to follow at once.

The French commander, General Bosquet, also felt that the real attack was being made on Inkerman, and that the attacks elsewhere were merely feints, and he ordered two battalions and a half and two troops of horse artillery to march in that direction,

Digitized by Google

and was hastening thither in person, when unfortunately he met Sir George Brown and Sir George Cathcart, who from false pride declined his proferred help, and declared that the English had sufficient reserves. With equal severity and truth Mr. Kinglake remarks of the terrible military blunder on the part of the two English Generals. Certainly Brown and Cathcart, being unacquainted with the enemy's design for overwhelming Pennefather with 40,000 men, had not even the rudiments of that knowledge which alone would have warranted an English officer in disdaining all need of French support on Mount Inkerman, and directing General Bosquet's resources into another part of the field. It was dawn of day when the Russian troops directed against Inkerman reached it, and when a sentry in advance on Shell Hill, which is a height on the Inkerman ridge, discerned through the dimness of the mist a Russian column approaching, and reported it to Captain Rowland, the officer in command of the picket. The English pickets opened fire, and the two batteries halted, fell back, in surprise. The gathering, swaying, pushing thousands soon reasserted their power and advanced, and in less than half-an-hour they achieved three-fourths of their purpose by crowning the crest of Shell Hill with a battery of twenty-two guns. General Pennefather, in the absence of his invalided chief, Sir de Lacy Evans, was in command of the three thousand light troops occupying now a quarter of the Inkerman position. Mr. Kinglake thinks, and we believe with reason, that had Sir de Lacy Evans commanded the Inkerman division he would have carried out the successful tactics of the Lesser Inkerman, by concentrating his 8,000 on the Greater Inkerman, and would have lured the advancing Russians within the deadly range of his guns. Pennefather, however, finding his pickets not only engaged in conflict with the enemy, but apparently with success, pushed forward small companies of troops "to feed his pickets."

"On this errand he sent the 30th Regiment divided into two wings. He pushed forward the 41st Regiment under General Adams towards his right front. In the same direction, but with orders to halt and take post on the right of the Home Ridge, Colonel Percy Herbert moved up one wing of the 49th under Bellairs; whilst on the opposite or left side of the field the other wing under Dalton, together with a wing of the 47th under Major Fordyce, was pushed forward to the head of the Mikriakoff Glen. For a while, the 95th remained posted on the reverse slopes of Home Ridge; but before long, its scanty strength was divided into wings, of which one under Champion advanced towards the Sandbag battery, whilst the other under Hume pushed forward in the centre of the field. As to the 55th, it had furnished that day a large proportion of the 2d Division pickets, and the companies so

Digitized by Google

employed were already out fighting at the extreme front. Thus, then, with the exception of some companies of the 47th and the remnant of the 55th, not already engaged at the outposts, the whole of the 2d Division was sooner or later taken off from the heights which constituted the natural stronghold of the Inkerman position, and for the most part pushed forward in numerous small bodies under separated leaders, who whilst working in mist and through brushwood, were not to be easily reached by any command from Headquarters.

"From the time when this diffusion of troops towards the front had fully taken effect, the whole number of English infantry then left to defend the Home Ridge, or, in other words, to guard the first and last stronghold of the Inkerman position, against the army brought up to attack it, became reduced to only a few hundred."

In the midst of this plan of defence Lord Raglan appeared on the scene, but did not perplex his subordinate by a blind and capricious exercise of authority, but left Pennefather to carry out his plan. The Commander-in-Chief, however, saw at a glance the means of over-matching the Russian artillery, and by a happy thought which turned eventually the entire fortune of the day, he ordered two of the 18-pounders belonging to the siege-train to be brought up and placed in position. While the artillery plied the Russian batteries and eventually dislodged them and poured a murderous fire on the dense columns of one portion of the Russian front, another portion, the nearest to our troops, was attacked by our troops in a series of charges which reflect the most brilliant glory on our troops. We quote one specimen of these charges, that of Colonel Egerton with his 259 men. Egerton at once gave word, "Halt, then fire a volley and charge."

"The foremost of the Russians had not long stopped their advance, when across the dim, narrow space, now dividing them from Egerton's force, they heard English words of command. They saw their foe come to a halt. They saw his long hedgerow of fire-locks, now engrafted with bayonets, bend down, come level, then blaze, and in the instant a pitiless volley tore through their loose masses in front, and swept down like a blast on the face of the column behind them. Then, from under the new ridge of smoke which Egerton's troops by this fire had piled up along their whole line, there rose the 'Hurrah!' of the English, as though in some outburst of joy. Whilst the Russians yet listened to the roar of their enemy's welcome, all before them lay still wrapt in cloud; but presently, those who stood calm, and could look in the eye of the storm, saw here and there, moving in dimness, the shadowy form of a rider, the naked gleam of a sword, then the wing of the 77th, along its whole front, bursting out once more into sight through the bank of the smoke, and tearing straight down at a run, with bayonets brought low to the 'charge.'

Digitized by Google

"Though the Russians first exposed to the charge had sought, as we know, to maintain that formation of 'company columns,' which grew afterwards famous in Europe, the thickness of the brushwood or some other cause had prevented them from giving fair trial to the lessons of their German advisers, and they hung together in knots, or grosser aggregates, neither having the formidable massiveness of a close battalion column, nor the agile, sagacious vivacity which belongs to smaller units of strength. They did not stand. They broke away as they could, or threw themselves down in the thicket, affecting to be slain, and their overthrow was but a beginning of evil, for the solid column behind them, being now all at once laid bare to the onslaught descending against it, began to waver, and stopped. Then it heaved, then broke, and before the swift-coming line had yet touched it with steel, was turning as though for flight."

Driven back at last, after nearly twelve hours hard fighting, from the Inkerman mountain the Russians retired, and suffered severely in the early part of this retreat. The recovered ground was everywhere covered with dead and dying Russians.

"From some of these last there came cries and moans which were piteous to hear. Some found means to cry out for 'the hospital,' some for 'water,' some only for pity. Men appealed in their agonies to a common faith, and invoked the name of her who must be dear—so they fondly imagined—to all the Churches of Christ. There was one of these wounded Russians who crawled to the side of Lord Raglan, imploring for a draught of water. Lord Raglan—with his own hand—with his one kindly hand—made haste to raise the man's head, supporting him tenderly in a sitting posture, and asked, whilst he did so, for means to quench the sufferer's thirst; but he asked in vain. No officer near had a flask which had not been drained. Water, water, a drink of cold water, was more than the chief could grant in this, his hour of victory."

Mr. Kinglake dwells with painful interest on the fact that the pursuit of the enemy was not undertaken by the French Marshal, Canrobert, who had good fresh troops, the most of which had not been even into action. Our own troops were spent by exhaustion and could not move, and no attempt was made to turn the undisturbed retreat of the vanquished enemy into a bloody and headlong rush.

Recognising the hand of God in crowning our arms with victory in the terrible attack on Inkerman, as we feel ourselves bound in gratitude to do, we cannot and dare not disguise the deep feeling of pain with which we have noted the author's apparent indifference to the highest and truest cause of our triumphs in the Crimea. Nor is this our only ground of complaint. The oaths of commanding officers are recorded without a syllable of expressed reprehension of what we regard as a

Digitized by Google

repulsive habit, at once vulgar, undignified, and unchristian. Amongst the minor excellencies, however, of Mr. Kinglake's work it is only due to mention his anxiety to do full justice to the noblest qualities and the grandest achievements of our allies. He immortalizes in these picturesque pages the dashing valour of the sixty Zouaves, who in one episode of the burning swaying battle rescued our captured guns from the enemy. He tells, too, with evident zest and delight the story of the "Boussiniere" battery, which blazed away at the enemy, though itself searched again and again by the most murderous of fires. It is not often that the chroniclers of military exploits follow the example of Mr. Kinglake in recording the chivalrous deeds of the common soldier. "Honour to whom honour is due" has been throughout the principle of our author in awarding praise. The few officers high in command who blundered or faltered in their duty are impartially held up to scorn, while privates who displayed the noblest qualities of the British soldier receive in these pages the fullest recognition they so well won on the bloody battle-ground of Inkerman. Privates Hill, Archer, Troy, Bancroft, Fuller, and others of the like class owe much to Mr. Kinglake's impartial narrative, and the British nation may be well proud not only of such soldiers, but of an historian who recognises merit wherever he finds it, in the lowest of the ranks.

ON SELF-CONSECRATION.

SELF-CONSECRATION has recently come to the front, with its urgent and serious claims on the Christian's attention. We cannot accept without reservation the conceptions on this subject advanced by some who have introduced it. But with those who are insensible to its essential importance, and permit their displeasure or disgust at the misconceptions of others to justify their insensibility, we confess at once that we have no sympathy.

We know that to consecrate is to set apart what is consecrated to a sacred person or to a sacred purpose. Now, it is simply impossible to be a Christian without an act of self-dedication, effected either explicitly or implicitly, which shall be a consecration in both senses. What, we ask, is a Christian? He is a disciple of Christ; and a disciple is a scholar who *segregates* himself that he may be taught in the class of his teacher, or be as a sheep of Christ that hears His voice and follows Him. But whom does he follow? Him whom the Jews, aided by the Gentiles, devoted to the cross as an abominable thing, fit only to be

Digitized by Google

cast out and annihilated,—Him who said of His followers, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, and I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." Verily, to be with Him as a follower we must dislocate ourselves with regard to "this present evil world," and separate ourselves expressly and deliberately. And what is separation unto the Holy One of God, in whom is no sin?—separation unto the discipleship of the Son of Him, who is at once in essence the self-existent, and in essence without sin,—but consecration to a sacred person? Further, he that comes to Christ is the subject of an attraction which is the resultant of two forces,—of the drawing power of Jesus as an object contemplated, that creates motives which the subject recognises, feels, and yields to consciously and deliberately,—and of the constraining power of God's choice realizing its purpose in a secrecy which is impenetrable, by operating, not on the subjective consciousness, but on the objective being of the elected. Now, of such what is the specific destiny? According to St. Peter they are "elect according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father, through *sanctification* of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus." According to St. Paul, Jesus "gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and *purify unto Himself* a peculiar people zealous of good works." Can a moral agent be the subject of such a deliverance and purification, independently of the intervention of his own will, without a voluntary surrender of himself to be wrought upon by the agency that comes to his rescue,—without submission to whatever endurance and active co-operation on his part may be requisite,—without, in short, an exact dedication of himself to the precise end, which in this case is obviously consecration to a sacred purpose? Thus a mere advancement of a few casual texts have sufficed to call to recollection that to be a Christian we must consecrate ourselves,—must be consecrated in every sense,—that "Saint," the first appellation of the Christian, was and is his proper and specific denomination.

To have a just conception of the sacred Person to whom we are consecrated, and of His and our reciprocal relations, and to occupy our own habitually,—to have a just conception of the sacred purpose to which we are consecrated, and of the means and methods by which it is to be effected, and to be in the personal and successful practice of them,—is simply to be an adept in Christianity. It is at our peril, therefore, obviously, that we either disregard or misunderstand the subject of consecration.

A misconception is most hazardous. We cannot therefore treat as secondary a mistake on the part of the late Dr. Thomas C. Upham, an American Professor of Mental and Moral Phi-

Digitized by Google

losophy,—once apparently the adviser of good Mr. R. Pearsall Smith, to whom British Christians are, we understand, much indebted for the resuscitation of the subject in question at present. Consecration, according to his view, may be absent at our entrance on the position and state of a Christian. He writes of it, at least, as if it were a stage or condition which might be entered subsequently. On this assumption he calls it not *the* consecration of a Christian, but *a* consecration "which necessarily brings one into a new relationship with God." For such a notion we find no warranty in Scripture. The dedication which is there insisted on is that which is attested and symbolized at Baptism; and so symbolized, that, unless it be effected, the vital union with Christ, through which we acquire effectually the specific position of a Christian, and initiate our personal salvation, is not consummated.

We cannot forget the startling interrogation by which St. Paul introduces his specific proof of the proposition, that to be a real Christian *at all* we must be consecrated in that "real sense," which, in his language, consigns the subject to be "dead to sin:" namely, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" We remember that the Apostle trembled at the supposition as it emerged, as if it had been a spirit direct from the council-chamber of the enemy of God and man,—akin to the occupant of the serpent, when he suggested to the credulous woman, "Ye shall not surely die." Quick as the echo, faithful as the spirit of truth, sympathetic as the instinct of holy love, he replied, "God forbid! How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In his excitement St. Paul presented, somewhat sharply, a reply in the negative to the momentous question which he had started,—a reply direct, full, and conclusive. But such it could be only on the assumption that at baptism there is a dedication of the baptized to a state of death unto sin, through union with Christ, in order that he may be in such a condition as to receive the impartation of new life, and be enabled to live unto God like Christ, and walk accordingly. And what is that but consecration?

True it is that what is represented at baptism may not then be effected, and may be effected, in all its reality and efficiency, at some subsequent date; but in this case the consecration finally achieved is not other, in any respect, than what is represented by the symbolism of baptism: it is simply a realization of the very same. Dr. Upham therefore was, as we think, in further

Digitized by Google

error, when instead of advancing an exposition of what is meant by baptism, in explanation of the Christian's self-consecration, he furnished a description invented by himself. He fortified his views by the adduction of certain remarks of Dr. Doddridge, with regard to the special act of self-dedication, which he recommends in the eleventh chapter of "The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul." To that work, so useful to many of the servants of Christ at the commencement of this century, we are personally much indebted; but from the chapter adduced we derived no advantage. We, in fact, question not alone the legitimacy and propriety, but the expediency of adopting any conception, or device of self-consecration, which does not amount to a delineation or exposition of that which is represented by the process of baptism, as it is expounded in Scripture.

ST. ANTONY added the rules of asceticism to his conception of consecration, so did BENEDICT, so did ST. FRANCIS; and what was the issue?—The engendering of the notion that to be a "religious," one who is perfect in Christ's service, we must do what He Himself never did,—what St. Paul assumed to be obviously out of the question,—that is, "We must go out of the world." What followed in the Church at large this separating from mankind and passing into solitude?—A perversion in the conception of religion, an enfeeblement in its specific power, spiritual and moral, and a degradation of its practice. There is but one method, as we are disposed to assert, to restore the religion of the present day to the transparent purity, elastic power, and irrepressible progress distinguishing its character and career at first, and to protect it from a similar degeneration in the coming ages; and that is a rigid attention to the prescriptions of its divine Head, and of its original inspired authors.

With regard to self-consecration, we are certain that a rapid survey of the sort of consecration required on the part of one who is in a state of salvation, will suffice to convince us that that which is delineated by the symbolism of baptism, as a programme, is precisely what is required: the most expedient, as well as the most authoritative; the most manageable, as well as the most correct.

But first, what is the peril to which one who is already in a state of salvation, is exposed?

If redemptiom were now applied to both of the elements composing man,—to his body as well as to his spirit,—his redemption would be consummated, and he would be exposed to no peril whatever. But St. Paul informs us that at present the redemption of Christ is not applied to man's body,[a] but to his

[a] Rom. viii. 23—25.

Digitized by Google

spirit only; wherefore after its application to the latter, the disease designated the flesh by St. Paul still remains.

His indeed is not the carnal mind, the subject of which is destitute of the love of God, and therefore at once at enmity with Him, and incapable of obeying with the heart the law of God, which because it is His will is godlike, and not capable of being obeyed from the heart, save by him who loves God. On the contrary his is the spiritual mind. The love of God is in him: he can keep the law of God from the heart.

Again, he is no longer in captivity to the "law of sin and death," which is in the members of the fallen man. So long as we are untouched by the application of Christ's redemption, we are in "the flesh;" and whatever that condition may be, it is such that he that is in it cannot obey the law of God from the heart. On the contrary, when he applies to himself the commands of that law, insisting on the obedience of his heart, under the threat of condemnation, he provokes the concupiscence of the flesh; realizes the presence and action of certain affection and lusts, which, if fulfilled, issue in a viciousness the details of which are in each case violations of the law. Thus when he would do good evil is present with him, and he is helpless. To be thus is to be "in the flesh." He to whom redemption is applied is not in the flesh: he is "in the spirit." Through the Spirit of God that dwells in his spirit, he is quickened; by lusts and affections, engendered by the Spirit of God, he is animated. These enable him to realize in himself the love of God, and to feel animated by the very motives that prompt to the proper obedience of God's law. He therefore is able to obey it from the heart, and to feel that he does so. Hence from the captivity by which he was held while in the flesh, he is emancipated.

But the flesh, with its own proper affections and lusts, still subsists in him, and consequently in his position there is hazard and a serious peril. What is it precisely? He is moved at one and the same time by the lusting of the spirit, and by the lusting of the flesh. The peril is that he should yield to the latter instead of the former, and fulfil it. From the respective natures of those two forces, the peril involves life or death.

The flesh is the issue of the fall of man. It exists as a fulfilment, in part, of the sentence of death, the execution of which was then initiated. The lusting of the flesh therefore is disease, while the lusting of the spirit is health. Disease, therefore, comes into contact with health in him who is in the Spirit. If he resist, and refuse the lusting of disease and fulfil the lusting of health, the disease is diminished,—it is mortified, and the individual grows in spiritual strength and development. If this growth proceed, he brings forth the fruits of the Spirit: that is,

Digitized by Google

he grows in the likeness of Christ and God, and is proceeding towards the apprehending or grasping of the end for which Christ called or apprehended him, when He applied His redemption to him. If, on the contrary, he yield to the lusting of disease, and fulfil it, the health that is in him suffers; the Spirit that is in him, quickening and strengthening his spirit, is mortified. If this course be persevered in, the Spirit of Christ will forsake him utterly. Again, he will pass into the exclusive possession of the carnal mind, and be found in captivity again under the law of sin and death. Finally, he will perish, having the sentence of death initiated at the fall fully carried out in him eventually. St. Paul says expressly, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." "He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." (Rom. viii. 13.)

Now in the presence of such an exposure and contingency, what should be required of one who passes into a state in which the redemption of Christ is applied to him? Ought it not to be a solemn engagement never to yield to the lusting of the flesh, and always to follow and fulfil the lusting of the Spirit? This we shall find is the very obligation symbolised at baptism, and undertaken expressly then. To place this before the reader, few words on our part are required, but some patience on his is needed. We then assume at baptism the position of one who is in a state of salvation. What is that position precisely? We reply at once, It is union with Christ. But what are the specific characteristics of that union?

They are represented by the transaction at baptism. We repeat words already quoted: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

That which lies at the foundation of this transaction is the junction of the individual to the Incarnate Son of God, which is effected by God in response to his act of faith. When effected, the characteristics of the union, as represented in these words, are so peculiar, that to be correctly understood no small amount of careful attention is requisite. Looking very closely, we perceive that the union is such as would seem to be impracticable, for it is a junction to Christ in His death, and a junction to Him in His resurrection. Thus the party joined is represented to be, at one and the same time, dead with Christ and alive with Christ,—that is, in a state of death, and in a state of life, contemporaneously.

Digitized by Google

In advancing this interpretation we make no mistake, for it is precisely the description which St. Paul has furnished of his own state. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

He asserts first that he is dead,—"I am crucified;" then that he is alive,—"nevertheless I live." Thereupon, he shows that this is possible, because, in him remaining dead, it is Christ that lives. The life that animates him is not his own vitality, it is that of his risen Head. The spring or fountain, from which it issues and circulates, is not he himself, it is Christ,—or "hid with Christ in God." It reaches him only by circulation from the Head, and is sustained simply through the continuance of that circulation on the part of the Head. That continuance is contingent: it depends on the continuance of Paul's faith. If his faith fail,—if he do not "keep the faith," his junction to Christ, wrought by God, is of such a nature, that it will be severed, and his reception of vitality from Christ will cease. For, through the instrumentality of faith, God wrought that junction at first, and it is only through the same instrumentality that He maintains it afterwards. What, then, is the upshot? All of Paul that is not animated by the life imparted by Christ, is death, and whatever lives is that in him which is quickened and kept alive through that communicated life; and the maintenance of the vitality is dependent on the existence and action of Paul's faith in Christ. It follows that death with Christ,—a death which is continuous,—is that to which we are consecrated at baptism. This is the first lesson taught us by its symbolism. What is the next?

It teaches us that this death is not death simply initiated and in a state of progress, like that of Him who is nailed to the Cross and not as yet dead. It is death consummated, for we are said to be *buried* with Christ in baptism. And what is the next?

It teaches us that we are buried with Christ for a specific purpose: namely, that we may be in a proper condition for the reception of the life which the risen Christ communicates. It follows that were we not absolutely dead with the buried Saviour, we should not receive the life He imparts, any more than He would have received the vitality that raised Himself, unless He had previously been absolutely dead. This purpose is evidently expressed by these words,—"we are buried" with Christ. "*That* like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life." This lesson, however, extends further. It teaches that the life com-

Digitized by Google

municated is given that it may be co-exercised in a specific manner; that is, to prompt and enable us to walk in newness of life. Now this exercise depends on our own will. It will be effected in fact if our faith be in exercise. If we live by faith, then we shall make use of the life imparted by God through Christ when He joined us to the Saviour dead and buried, in the precise way indicated at our baptism.

We must not forget that baptism is the seal of a covenant to which there are two parties. It symbolizes, therefore, more than the engagement of God. That of the person baptized is represented by the same symbolism. St. Paul adds, that "our old man is crucified with Him (Christ) that the body of sin may be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin;" which crucifixion, of course, includes that of "the flesh with its affections and lusts." The old man is the individual himself who is baptized, in the specific state and character to which his former conversation, in his positive way of living before baptism has brought him. The issue of this development, St. Paul asserts to be, a man that is "Corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." (Eph. iv. 22.) He himself was in this condition, the individual nailed to the cross of Christ at baptism; when he placed himself in the state of the dying. His engagement was, that whatever of the old man should remain in him when once he should be quickened by the Spirit of life, he would keep in a state of crucifixion, that is, powerless to hinder the purpose of God in bestowing that life which was that the individual should walk in newness of life, "putting on the new man which is created after God in righteousness and true holiness."

The exact import of the symbolism of Baptism is now before us.

(1) It represents the personal consecration of the Christian. He devotes the old man to crucifixion,—that is to the immobility of the state of the crucified, and to the progressive death, which is the experience of one nailed to a cross and kept in that position, and this in order that he may "put on the new man," through union with Christ, in His death, and in His life.

(2) It represents the state of the Christian as contemplated by God. He imputes to him a consummated death with Christ, and consequently He justifies him, and quickens him together with Him. The imputation of His death is continuous. He, in fact, is regarded by God as dead with Christ, so long as he abides in Christ,—that is so long as his faith, the uniting link, is alive. Hence his justification is continuous, as well as his participation with Christ in exemption from the authority of the law, that exemption achieved by Him when once He had discharged its claims by death, and was dead. The Christian's subsequent

Digitized by Google

violations of law do not bring him under its condemnation and curse so long as he abide in, and work with Christ, and thus is in the Spirit. From the guilt of such he is discharged by the forgiveness of God in His character as a Father, on his confession of sin, seeing that through the intercession and propitiation of Christ he is preserved in a state of Grace.

(3) But the symbolism of Baptism represents the state of the Christian as one of contingency and probation. It is only on behalf of those who carry out the engagement made at Baptism —that is, the crucifixion of the flesh—that God carries out His engagement as there represented and guaranteed, continuing to impute to them death and justification with Christ, and to maintain in them the circulation of the life of Christ, through the Spirit. The contingency is in all respects perfect; for it would appear that it extends to the spirit and resource in which the act of self-consecration is carried out. The more zealous and successful the individual is in maintaining the crucifixion of the old man, the greater will be the ministration of life, and the actual resurrection of the person in the type of the new man. This seems to be implied by the unlimitedness of the assertion of St. Paul: "If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live."

Such is the simple, unembarrassed, and positive view of the state and function of a Christian for which we are indebted to the symbolism of baptism and St. Paul's exposition of it. A determination to be brief has constrained us to be succinct, and to refrain from referring to Scripture proofs of all our assertions. Obscurity, in some parts of our exposition, may have been the consequence; in which case, we venture to refer to our paper on "Christian Perfection," in the *Christian Observer* for September, 1874, for a fuller treatment of some parts of the subject. The conclusion, however, must be intelligible to all.

The part of the Christian is simply to practice the crucifixion of the old man, to which we consecrated ourselves at baptism. In that case God, through the ministry of Christ as our High Priest in heaven, and the medium of Christ as our Head on earth, will, by the agency of the Holy Spirit whom Jesus administers, accomplish in us, whatever else may be required, in order that we may "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

But how shall we practice this self-consecration? By faith in two senses. (1) Faith, if it be alive, will create and sustain the instinct that enables us to detect the movements of the old man in us, and prompt us effectually to keep them, as those of that which is nailed to the cross, in operation. Besides, it will keep us alive to the voice of the Spirit of life, and to its import, when

Digitized by Google

His specific vitality moves in us the suggestion of the mind of Christ, and the motives of His heart, and prompts us, with the lustings of the Spirit, and it will require us, working by love as it does, to fulfil them from time to time. (2) Faith will protect us against failure, by forbidding us to place any reliance for strength and wisdom in the execution of our purposes on ourselves,—that is, on that part of us which does not own its sufficiency for any thing which it can do to the Spirit: namely, the flesh. Faith will require and enable us to realize the presence of Christ our Head, and His readiness to act in us, through His ndwelling Spirit, and so to place our trust in Him for all needed wisdom and strength and motive: then we shall succeed; for if "strengthened by Christ" like St. Paul, we shall find ourselves doing "all things."

And what shall be the issue? (1)—Our faith will be kept in exercise. Through exercise it will continue to live. Living, it will survive the mortal attacks of every temptation to sin that may assail us, and every failure on our part. The full salvation, —for the accomplishment of which we, first, through the crucifixion of the old man, consecrated ourselves to the Person and work of Christ,—will be secured; for we shall "keep the faith," and thus maintain the union with Christ, our justification before God, and the title which it confers and upholds to a crown of righteousness with Him at His coming. Let us ponder the record furnished by St. Paul, of his own fulfilment of his personal consecration to Christ. (See Phil. iii. 7—15.)

THE GNOSTIC HERESIES.

The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries: by the late H. L. Mansel, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, some time Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. With a Sketch of his Work, Life, and Character, by the Earl of Carnarvon. Edited by J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's. Murray. 1875.

THE three distinguished names prefixed to this work, those of the author, biographer, and editor, are enough to secure for it beforehand respectful attention. But the book is abundantly well able to speak for itself. A subject of very deep interest for historian, philosopher, and Christian, is handled in it by a mind eminently vigorous, full of exact and ample knowledge,

Digitized by Google

and speaking in an English style as clear and healthy as the subject, in most of its aspects, is perplexed. It is emphatically a masterly book.

We offer no detailed remarks on the Earl of Carnarvon's very interesting *Sketch*. It forms so small a portion of the volume, and deals with a character already well-known in its outlines to so many readers, that in our necessarily short account of the book in general we must only allude to it. Dr. Lightfoot's share in the work calls for brief but cordial thanks. His work, he tells us, has been almost exclusively that of superintending the passage through the press of Dr. Mansel's Lectures (left in MS. at the author's death). But it is plain that in so doing Dr. Lightfoot has watched well over the literary and historical correctness of the pages submitted to him; and even the negative security of such a scrutiny by a thorough and singularly careful Scholar is a positive benefit of no mean kind.

In the *Preface*, Dr. Lightfoot remarks, in a few suggestive sentences, on the importance of the subject of the Lectures, and the opportuneness of their appearance:—

"The time is gone by when the Gnostic theories could be regarded as the mere ravings of religious lunatics. The problems which taxed the powers of a Basilides and a Valentinus are felt to be among the most profound and most difficult which can occupy the human mind. Even the Gnostic solutions of these problems are not altogether out of date in the second half of this nineteenth century, as the dualistic tendencies of Mr. J. S. Mill's posthumous Three Essays will show. At such a time an exposition of the subject from a distinctly Christian point of view, written by one who apprehended with singular clearness the gravity of the issues involved, cannot be regarded as otherwise than opportune. It is only by the study of Gnostic aberrations that the true import of the teaching of Catholic Christianity, in its moral as well as its theological bearings, can be fully appreciated."

The book consists of sixteen lectures, delivered at Oxford by Dr. Mansel, as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in the Lent Term of 1868. It is well-known that he had previously held the Waynflete Professorship of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. The present volume remarkably witnesses to the breadth and range of his mental power, as an ex-Professor of Philosophy lecturing, almost on a sudden, on Historical Theology. On the other hand, it illustrates the powerful influence for good which one range of knowledge in the mind may exercise over another; for probably without a previous metaphysical training of the rarest kind the theological historian of Gnosticism would have been quite unable to indicate with decisive

Digitized by Google

accuracy and clearness the philosophical origin and tendency of the Gnostic errors, and their kinship to much later speculations. Of such indications the lectures are full, and the remarks in this direction are always made with the unmistakable manner of one who not only possesses, but has matured, his knowledge.

The series stands arranged as follows. The first lecture is introductory; the second and third discuss the probable and possible *sources* of Gnosticism; the fourth and fifth collect the notices of Gnosticism in the *New Testament;* the sixth deals with the teaching of *Simon Magus* and *Menander* as precursors of Gnosticism; the seventh, with the *Ophite* sects; the eighth, with *Cerinthus,* and the Nazarenes and Ebionites; the ninth, with *Saturninus* and the Syrian School; the tenth, with *Basilides;* the eleventh and twelfth, with *Valentinus* and his followers; the thirteenth, with *Marcion;* the fourteenth, with the *Clementines;* the fifteenth and sixteenth, with the *Christian Opponents* of Gnosticism,—Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus.

The introductory lecture is full of information and suggestion. The usage of the word γνῶσις in the special sense in question is examined, and shown to be in practice confined to the designation of systems of speculation later in date than the Christian Revelation, and bearing relation to it in one way or another; not standing aloof from it, or unconscious of it, as mere philosophies, Gentile or Jewish. The γνῶσις was indeed so far true to its name, that it was in spirit always intellectual and speculative; an effort to solve problems, and above all, the two great problems of the causation of relative by absolute existence, and of the origin of evil. But the γνῶσις so far stood connected with Christianity that the idea of a *Redemption,* scarcely visible at all in Greek speculation, is traceable throughout all its schools. They all present us, at one point or another, with a *Christ,* sometimes with more Christs than one. And yet the redemption thus dilated upon is profoundly alien from that of the Scriptures. It is a deliverance, not from sin as a transgression of the law, but from ignorance, from imperfection, from *relativity.* It is the redemption congenial to a Pantheist theory of the world, in which "evil is no longer a moral but a natural phenomenon," and in which "the personality of God having disappeared, the personality of man disappears along with it." We may remark that the essentially Pantheistic character of very many of the Gnostic systems is continually brought out through the book,—very characteristically, on the part of the author of the *Limits of Religious Thought Examined;* and, we may add, always with the greatest seriousness as well as cogency. Dr. Mansel plainly

Digitized by Google

felt that he could not too often or too earnestly warn the thinking world of the inevitable tendency of a Pantheistic philosophy, whether that of Basilides or that of Hegel, *to eliminate the idea of sin as sin.* And he is equally in earnest to point out that the hopeless effort to understand and describe the Eternal Being as He is in Himself, must either be entirely resigned, in order that thought may repose in His own chosen method of revelation of Himself as we are able to understand Him, *or* must lead by a sure path to the denial of His personality and our own accountability. It would be long to extract from the book even the best of the many admirable paragraphs and *dicta* upon this subject. One aspect of the work, and not its least valuable, is that of an exposure of some of the main perils of modern speculation by copious illustrations from the facts of ancient heretical ontology and cosmogony.

The two lectures (ii. and iii.) on the *Sources* of Gnosticism deal with a necessarily obscure historical problem. On the whole, Dr. Mansel proves that into the growth of the *Gnosis* entered as elements: (1) the Platonic philosophy, as modified (in Philo's hands) by contact with Revelation; (2) the Persian belief of two eternal principles, an absolute evil as well as absolute good; (3) the Buddhist Pantheism, with its theory of emanations and of the radical hostility of spirit and matter. To these he doubtingly adds the Jewish Kabbala, the doubt being whether the *Gnosis* did not historically *precede* the Kabbala. The extant Kabbalistic *writings* very probably belong to the early middle ages; but their philosophy, which is thoroughly pantheistic, traces back apparently to the age of the captivity. The Persian religion was not at all pantheistic, but in the pantheistic Kabbala appear striking resemblances in detail to the Persian cosmogony. From Ormuzd arose three orders of beings; the first of them being the six *Amshaspands;* while from the *En Soph*, or Abstract Infinite, of the Kabbala, sprung the ten *Sephiroths*; and so on through after stages. Gnosticism on the whole shows certain traces either of a Kabbalistic influence, or influence from sources common to it and to the Kabbala.

The whole passage (in lect. iii.) on this topic is valuable as a clear and learned summary of an obscure but most momentous subject. We feel the unvarying and unclouded glory of the revelation of a personal God in the vast historic range of the Jewish Scriptures all the more vividly for a distinct review of this totally alien tendency of native Jewish speculation on God and the world.

The lectures (v. and vi.) which treat of the *notices of Gnosticism in the New Testament* collect into a clear focus very many scattered indications; and Dr. Mansel well knows how to sift the certain

Digitized by Google

from the doubtful. He questions any allusion to the Gnosis in the Epistle to the Romans, and speaks hesitatingly of the frequent passages in the Corinthian Epistles where the word γνῶσις is used *in malam partem*, and of the theory that Gnostic errors, with others, are combated in 1 Cor. xv. Even in the Ephesian Epistle he doubts (very justly, we think) whether the πλήρωμα (i. 23, iv. 13) of St. Paul is an allusion to the Gnostic πλήρωμα, or *vice versa*. In the Colossian Epistle, on the other hand, he doubts not that a judaizing Gnosticism, such as that of Cerinthus, later, is directly refuted; a *philosophy*, professing to teach an inner knowledge of invisible things, and which seems (like almost all the Gnostic sects) to have denied the identity of the Creator and the Supreme Being. In Col. i. 16, 17; ii. 8, 18, 20—23, and other passages, a reference to Gnostic error is forcibly argued. In the First Epistle to Timothy the ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις "is distinctly mentioned under its own name." In the Second Epistle the remarkable passage, ii. 16—18, is viewed in the light of Gnostic teaching and shown to apply to it. So too iii. 1—7. The denunciations of St. Peter (in the Second Epistle) and St. Jude (whose Epistle is regarded as a direct reference to St. Peter's), the condemnation of the Nicolaitans in the Apocalypse; the "depths of Satan, as they speak" (Rev. ii. 24); are all taken as anti-Gnostic; and the Gospel and First Epistle of St. John are shown to be filled with dogmatic statements and warnings directly aimed at what we know were the errors of Cerinthus. A striking passage (p. 78) closes this lecture, on the practical testimony of the Apostle of Love to the *necessity* in Christianity of historical fact and supernatural doctrine.

The sixth lecture treats on the teaching of Simon Magus, with his successor Menander. Dr. Mansel is inclined to believe the Ἀπόφασις Μεγάλη (a long extract from which is extant in Hippolytus) to have been the work of Simon. If so, Simon's own account of his theology is as dark as it is profane. From all we know of him, however, we gather that he stands in one remarkable respect apart from the Gnostic schools proper. He and they bring in alike the idea of a redemption, and of the creation of the material world by powers alien from the Supreme. But he, unlike them, claims to be *himself* the Redeemer, and apparently indeed also the remote cause of the visible world. His companion, Helena, was the first *Conception* of his mind; she descended into the lower world from him, and originated the angels who made this world. At length, to rescue his Conception from detention in the world, he had himself descended to appear as a man among men, though not in reality a man. He had seemed to suffer in Judæa, but had not really suffered. His

Digitized by Google

appearance as Simon was a reappearance of him who had been seen as Jesus.

In the midst of the profane vagaries of this teaching there are clear signs of connection with Persian and Kabbalist cosmogony; especially in the idea of a male and female pair of generating principles. The most probable tradition of Simon's end seems to point to the same blasphemous imitation of our Lord which comes out (as above) in his doctrine. Hippolytus records that he ordered his disciples to bury him, promising to rise again the third day.

The seventh lecture gathers up what is known of the *Ophite* sects; perhaps the earliest of the Gnostics proper. These sects were named from their common veneration of the mysterious *serpent*,—the agent in the Fall. To the Ophites the Fall was a stage in man's development,—a successful revolt against a malignant or corrupt Creator; and the mission of Christ, being a further rescue of man from the thraldom of matter, was thus not a destruction, but a completion, of the works of the devil! One of the most remarkable of Dr. Mansel's "parallels" closes this lecture. He traces a distinct likeness in radical theory between "the profound if misdirected speculations" of Hegel, and "this wildest of the disordered dreams of heathen Gnosticism." "Every attempt to represent the course of the world, including man as a part of the world, in the form of a necessary evolution .... whether it take the pantheistic form..... or the materialistic.... must, as the very condition of its existence, ignore the distinction between good and evil (except as in their consequences, not in themselves), and must annihilate the idea of sin, which is not a consequence, but a transgression of God's law.

Cerinthus and the Ebionites and Nazarenes are the main topic of the eighth lecture. Besides them we have a notice of Carpocrates and his son Epiphanes, who, resembling Cerinthus in some main respects, differed from him in representing Jesus the Redeemer as in reality hostile to the Mosaic law (the work of the evil Creator), and (with a manifest allusion to the *Phædrus*), as being animated with a soul which remembered its visions in a previous existence while borne along round the universe in company with the Supreme God. Cerinthus, on the contrary, was a Judaizer in a certain sense, holding that the law was imperfect but not evil. His Christology taught that Jesus, a mere man, was born and lived, was crucified and rose again (an important evidence from heresy to the resurrection of our Lord); but that at his baptism the Christ descended on him and left him before his death. This Christ "announced the unknown Father, and worked miracles." An interesting passage on the

Digitized by Google

origin of the names *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites* occurs pp. 123—126. It is probable that both were originally used as names (of hostile contempt) for the whole Christian body; but that the circumstances of the flight to Pella, and the ruin of Jerusalem, led to a separation of the more rigid Judaizers, who remained at Pella, while their brethren, disclaiming all Jewish connection, were permitted by the Romans to return to Jerusalem. The Separatists, retaining the ancient *soubriquets* as (perhaps) titles of honour, relapsed more and more into humanitarian views of the Messiah.

Lecture ix. is on the Gnostics of Syria (as distinguished from those of Egypt). Saturninus is here the heresiarch, and with him appear Tatian and Bardesanes, of whom the former was at one time a Christian in full profession, and the latter probably regarded himself as a Christian to the last, being in fact "only partially a Gnostic." Saturninus and Tatian both held the Creator to be alien from the Supreme. Matter was to them evil, though only neutrally so; but they recognised also an active and original principle of evil. The eternal Father made the world-creating angels, who also made man. Satan, the evil power, contended with the angels (who were imperfect) for the world. Christ descended to depose the angels, to repel Satan, and to deliver man from matter. Bardesanes differed from Saturninus in identifying the Creator and the Supreme.

The Gnostic heresiarch of *Egypt* (lecture x.) is Basilides. His *floruit* may be placed in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117—138). In some remarkable respects his teaching is *sui generis* among the Gnostics. His First Cause is "The Non-existent God:" a Supreme, who as being unconditioned admits of no predication, not even that of existence. No "eternal matter," or antagonist eternal evil, is apparent in this Gnosticism. The world-theory of Basilides is a theory of development. The Non-existent "willed without will" to make a world,—that is, the seed of a world. In this seed were "three *sonships;*" "one fine, another gross, the third needing purification." This last appears to mean that part of the spiritual creation which remains on earth united —for a time—to material bodies. When the first two *sonships* had sprung up,—the one to the supreme region, the other to that next below it,—there arose a glorious being from the world-seed, the great ruler, *Abraxas*, begetting a greater Son. They rule an upper sphere of the lower world, a sphere reaching as low as the moon. All beneath this is ruled again by an inferior ruler (who is identified with the God of the Jews), and his Son. Redemption, to the redeemable souls of the *third sonship*, consists in illumination concerning the non-existent Supreme. This illumination travels down in succession to the first ruler, to the second ruler, to Jesus (the reality of whose history is allowed); and then to

Digitized by Google

all the remaining sons of God, the πνευματικοί, the Gnostics. In due time they ascend on high; the "great ignorance" (of all things above them) descends on the denizens of each sphere of the universe, and all things are restored which were originally in the primal seed. "The leading thought of Basilides is the continuity of the world's development. But while the system thus gains in philosophical unity, it loses in moral and religious significance. No place is left for the providence of God, nor for the free-will of man. The scheme almost approaches to a stoical Pantheism, and quite to a stoical Fatalism."

The two next lectures (xi. and xii.) deal with Valentinus and his followers. Valentinus was not quite a generation later than Basilides, and manifestly drew from his theories; but he developed them into an imaginative mythology of personifications to which, even in Gnosticism, there is no parallel. Instead of the Non-existent, he speaks of *Βυθὸς*, or *Depth*, as his Supreme; from whom (or from whom and his consort, *Silence*) descend in order three pairs of *Æons:* Mind and Truth, Word and Life, Man and Church; a male and female in each case. From one of these pairs springs a second order of five pairs; from another of the first pairs springs a third order of six pairs. In this "wild play of the imagination," Dr. Mansel detects an attempt to represent the Supreme,—first, in his absolute nature; secondly, in his relative nature, in operation;—and to represent his relations to the world and man. The *world* thus far, however, means an ideal world only: the formation of the visible world is accounted for a legend wild among even the dreams of Valentinus. The youngest Æon, Sophia, passionately longed to understand the Supreme: her Design was frustrated and separated from her. Christ and the Holy Spirit,—two Æons newly derived,—restore calm in the upper world; but outside of it the banished *Design*, now a *Person*, animated by a second Christ, passionately in her turn longs to re-enter. From her emotion is produced material, animal, and spiritual substance. Her child is the Creator (*Δημιουργός*); from whom, probably, a third Christ was held to be begotten,—the Christ of the Gospel, according to Valentinus.

Dr. Mansel in a very masterly manner analyses the conceptions underlying this mythological maze, and remarks that "the system of Valentinus, like that of Basilides, is in principle pantheistic, which is indeed the tendency and danger of every system of philosophy which aspires to solve the mystery of the origin of derived existence from one absolute principle." He inclines to believe Valentinianism to be subsequent to, and closely connected with, the Jewish Kabbala (p. 201).

To the remaining four lectures we must give a notice even briefer than that given to the first twelve. Our reason for

Digitized by Google

contracting at this point is, that though the latter part of the book is full of value and interest, it is less characteristic, by the nature of the case. Gnosticism, as an effort to solve the riddles of Being and the Universe, culminated in Valentinus and subsided. Marcion (lecture xiii.) ranks as a Gnostic; denying as he did the identity of the God of the Old Testament with the God of the New. The very curious *Clementine Literature* (lecture xiv.) was also Gnostic in principle, though vehemently opposed to Marcionism in its strong anti-Judaistic tendency; but here again the Gnosticism no longer is original, and it comes in by the way, rather than as the main theme. Dr. Mansel consequently has less scope here for the peculiarly valuable application of his philosophical training to the analysis of the strangest (perhaps) of all the phenomena of doctrinal history within or beside the Christian Church. And the same may be said of the two closing lectures, admirable though they are as well-considered and well-worded reviews of four eminent and characteristic Church writers, as antagonists of Gnosticism.

In lecturing on Irenæus, Dr. Mansel has to do of course with his testimony to the Gospel of St. John; and it would have been a pleasure had space allowed, to dwell at large on the references made in the lectures to the bearing of the Gnostic controversy on the questions connected with that Gospel. The main argument of the work itself, however, as an account of what Gnosticism and its terminology really was, is in effect the most cogent evidence in favour of the apostolic authority of the Gospel. Mr. Sanday, in his very able book, "The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel" (Macmillan, 1872),—a book from whose implied theories of Divine inspiration we very widely differ, but which is an excellent specimen of literary and historical criticism,—points out how vastly greater is the internal probability that the Gnostics perverted the Fourth Gospel than that the Fourth Gospel was written in view of a *developed* Gnosticism. The lectures before us illustrate and confirm this remark very fully.

One isolated comment we must make with respect to an important doctrinal point. Here and there, in a moderate tone, but no less earnestly, if we mistake not, Dr. Mansel draws a warning parallel between some of the tendencies of Gnostic theology and those of what is commonly called Calvinism. Perhaps we may content ourselves with saying on the general question that the doctrines specially connected with the names of Calvin and St. Augustine (though certainly not with theirs alone) do anything rather than deny the reality of the human will; and that moreover, as held by many Christians who believe that they find them in Revelation, they are held, not as the main

Digitized by Google

lines of a fully-understood system of being, but emphatically as things "known in part,"—things full indeed of practical and holy meaning, but held and embraced as mysteries, whose *reason* is known to the Personal and Supreme Eternal, but not to us. If we are right, Dr. Mansel has accidently used the term "supra-lapsarian," p. 195, in a sense not that of Calvinist theologians.

But we cannot bid farewell to this admirable book with nothing better than a meagre summary of its contents, or exceptions taken against details. It is a book whose method and manner in themselves benefit the reader; an excellent specimen of that union of thoroughness with simplicity, of depth with clearness, of strong homely common sense with vast knowledge and equal breadth of thought, which seem to be characteristic of the best style of English philosophy, but which were also, by Lord Carnarvon's testimony, specially characteristic of Dr. Mansel as an individual. It is a book which is a model of historical statement and judgment, in the frequent passages where the discussion of questions of evidence on this point or that is done off-hand and by the way, as it might seem, but yet (when we look into it) done thoroughly and advisedly. But above all it is a book by a Christian thinker, whose mind was one "to which all the heights and depths of the most recent speculation respecting the highest truth that can be grasped by the human understanding were perfectly familiar" (Introduction, p. viii.); and who, in the whole drift of his thought on the perplexed and perplexing topic here before him, gives us, with singular clearness, the results of his reflections on the reasons and results of the radical difference between a religion of revelation and a religion of speculation. And amongst these reasons we feel, as we read, that a conviction which very different means originated in us is illustrated and deepened by this dark chapter in the history of the Church; the conviction that a knowledge of sin as sin,—as the transgression of the law,—and as needing not an illuminator or instructor merely, but a propitiatory Redeemer,—is a thing which lies at the very root of the religion which will even seem to stand under the strain (which the Christian can feel as well as the sceptic) of those great mysteries which excited the curiosity of the first century, and still agitate us and our world in the nineteenth. We place side by side one of the shadowy Christs of the Gnostic Myths, and the all-blessed Saviour who loved us and gave Himself for us; and we ask what makes the unutterable difference? Where does the thought-evolved Redeemer differ in the very idea from the revealed One? It is that the one is devised to rescue man in his pride from relativity; the Other is revealed, from the everlasting Father with whom He is One, to deliver man in his misery from sin.

Digitized by Google

THE COVENANTED PRESENCE OF CHRIST.

THE great commission recorded in the closing verses of St. Matthew's gospel, conveys the authority for all missionary enterprise and all pastoral work. Never was a commission so comprehensive in its terms. It is world-wide, grasping "all nations." Its duration is "even unto the end of the world." Its subject is "all that Jesus commanded." The special portion of this commission, which is the subject of this paper, is that which gives life and possibility to the whole,—the covenant of the PRESENCE with which it concludes: "Lo, I AM with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

I. If we would examine these words closely, there seems to be a preliminary question to be answered,—one not superfluous in such days as these,—to whom was this promise originally given? Certainly to the "eleven," as we are informed in the sixteenth verse. But were these all? There is reason to think they were not. The Bishop of Gloucester, in his "Historical Lectures," says, that "the terms of His promise seem fairly to imply the presence of the 500 brethren alluded to by St. Paul." He adds, that "nearly all the best recent commentators concur in supposing that the appearance of our Lord, mentioned in this close of St. Matthew's gospel, is identical with that alluded to by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6." He refers to the emphatic promise given by the angel (Matt. xxviii. 7) to the women: "He goeth before you into Galilee, there shall ye see Him." There was also His own promise (Matt. xxvi. 32): "After I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee." These things may probably have induced the brethren to take their way to Galilee, and there await the fulfilment. On these grounds the opinion widely prevails, that the assembled 500 mentioned by St. Paul received this promise; if not, no record remains of that remarkable gathering of disciples. However this may be, even if the promise were uttered at first to the eleven only, we maintain that it was not given for them alone, or for any limited line of successors, supposing that any could now trace an exclusive right of succession to apostolic privileges; for we cannot fail to remember that other promises already covered this very ground. Best known of all is that in Matt. xviii. 20: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Hence we feel entitled to say of these words before us, they are in themselves a general promise, which is here more especially applied to those who, from the first age until the end, may be engaged in the work of preaching the Gospel. This great truth may be further confirmed and illustrated from the figure of the Head

Digitized by Google

and the members, by which St. Paul twice explains the nature of the presence of the Lord. "Ye are the body of Christ," he says (1 Cor. xii. 27), "and members in particular" (ἐκ μέρους). And he proceeds to say that there were in that Church apostles, prophets, teachers, and other more occasional officers; but each of these, as the chapter teaches, equally members of Christ, though different parts of the organism of His body and possessing different functions. This figure views our promise fulfilled: each grade in the living Church enjoying the presence of Christ. He the Head, they the limbs of the body vitally united with Him. The Head sees, guides, instructs, informs, but does not execute: that is left for the members to do. Not that this exhausts the relation. No figure can include the whole. He is not *only* in the position of the Head to the members: He has other relations to His people, higher, greater, and wider.

Thus it seems clear that any limitations of the promise are brushed on one side; whether Papal, Episcopal, Presbyterian, or in any way sectional, no place is found for them. Christ is always with all His people, according to their place, necessity, and office in His body. But this consideration does involve a particular and blessed application of the covenant. The pious labourer or artificer shall have His presence; the merchant, the statesman who is in Christ, shall have it; the clergyman in a quiet English parish, the chaplain in a jail, the missionary to Jew or to heathen, shall have it; the confessor and the martyr shall have it. And with one voice, through all these ages, they have claimed the promise and owned its fulfilment. And that presence ensures to all not precisely the same grace in all respects, for there are "diversities of gifts, differences of administrations, diversities of operations;" but it ensures to all just the grace which the member needs for its own health, and for the due performance of its own specially appointed functions in the body, whatever these may be.

II. Having thus glanced at the ownership of the promise, we notice next the august manner in which it is given. As there is a regal style distinctly marked off from the diction which a subject may use, so there is in Holy Scripture a Divine style, marked off from the language which any creature may employ. One of the chief characteristics of this Divine style is the use of the expression "*I am.*" We had it in that other promise: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there *am I* in the midst of them;" not "there I *will* be." So here: "Lo *I am* with you always;" not "I *will be.*" This language is unspeakably and inalienably Divine. To none else but the Deity is the future thus present, thus certain, thus free from any contingency. To none but the Deity does it belong

Digitized by Google

"to have life in Himself," and to say as the simple assertion of the fundamental fact on which all other facts depend, "I am." I exist in myself, and of myself, independent of any other life, any other existence, any other power. Other things, whatever they may be, have contingent, conditioned endurance, according to my will; but I, conditioned by nothing outside of my own absolute will and my own perfect nature, from eternity to eternity alone can say "*I am.*" Such then is the presence that is covenanted: Divine in all its incommunicable essence. We need not dwell on the confidence, the expectations, the faith, the hope which the Christian gathers who grasps the fulness and the grandeur of this aspect of the passage.

III. We pass on to the duration of the covenant, "I am with you always" literally, "all the days," πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, not from time to time, when other affairs allow, when my attention is drawn to some important crisis, but all the days,—day by day as they pass. What, all the days? when Nero raged, when Arius taught, when Hildebrand ruled, when the Inquisition revelled in carnage, when missions were unknown? Yes: it must be so, for not one day can be excepted; and it has been often given to His people most of all to recognise His presence when to the world it was almost utterly veiled.

It is a grand idea, one that the human mind cannot grasp. We are charged by some of the modern unbelivers with lowering the idea of God by our anthropomorphic explanations of His principles and action. They will have something so inconceivable, so abstract, so removed from all human test or comparison, that though it may be adored, it may not be approached, may not be imagined, may not have any definite action ascribed to it. Their God is a God afar off, so far as he exists at all. But, as Bishop Butler teaches us, partial ignorance is not absolute ignorance. Because we know *little*, it is not therefore as if we knew *nothing*. We have a platform, a very narrow one indeed, but as far as it goes substantial and true, on which we erect a system of God's nature; and this is the mode in which Holy Scripture deals with it. We have in ourselves knowledge, reason, invention; we have the perception of justice, goodness, truth, law, and order. From these we can rise to the understanding in some measure of God as set forth in His Word. So in this of which we speak. We can understand the presence of a general with his army, of an architect among his workmen, of a merchant in his business, and we think of him as superintending and ordering each detail, and educing the great result. But although this may help us towards a conception of the Divine presence and superintendence, yet the vastness of the idea in the passage before us eludes our grasp, and soars upwards ever

Digitized by Google

higher and greater than we can imagine. That untiring energy, that ceaseless presence, that universal care, always in exercise! Age follows age, revolution follows revolution, yet *all the days* it remains true of Him who spoke: "I am with you alway." And it will be true to the destined close; for there is an appointed end to this presence, at least in that phase of it of which we speak, ἕως τῆς συντελειάς τοῦ αἰῶνος,—"even unto the end of the world,"—to the final close or completion of the age. When that may be knoweth no man, not even the Son, but the Father. But it will be when that comes of which St. Paul wrote: "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." But whenever and whatever that conclusion may be, that presence of which we speak shall abide till then.

Herein is the faith and patience of the saints; herein is the motive, the reason, the encouragement for all mission work, for all pastoral work, for all that gathers together the servants of Christ in labour for Him. Because He has promised His presence. and because He has manifested His presence, all the days to the very end, therefore His servants may, and can, and do work for Him and with Him.

IV. The most practically important portion of this subject for the present exigencies of the age seems to lie in the first of the three topics handled. To whom is the covenant of the presence sealed? For all profess to claim the Divine presence in perpetuity; and none so loudly, so arrogantly, and so exclusively as the Roman Pontiff; and next to him those who abuse the term Catholic so as to make it absolutely coterminous with the Episcopal limitations, or would even bring down the Lord bodily into or with a piece of bread, and so corporally claim His presence. In a lively narrative of the wanderings of some tourist in the west of France, some six or seven years ago, there was a sketch of a sermon of a French priest on the confidence of those who have the presence of Christ, something to this effect. "In London," said he, "during the recent visitation of the cholera, the Protestant clergy fled. Who could blame them? They had not the presence of Christ: they do not believe in it. What was there to support them? The Catholic clergy, on the other hand, were found at their posts among the dying. What sustained them? Their daily reception of Christ. They depart from the Mass knowing that they have Christ really present in them. They have actually taken and possess the presence of the body of Christ. What can harm them?" We say nothing of the libel on our brethren, who, as we know, so nobly, but so quietly did their duty. We wish to illustrate the degrading travesty of this grand subject which enslaves thousands.

Digitized by Google

For our own age, then, we hold this question paramount, whom did the Lord mean when He said "*With you:*"—"I am *with you*"? Here lies the vital distinction between truth and manifold error which Hooker's clear-sighted theology enabled him to lay his finger upon with certainty.

"That Church of Christ," says he (B. iii. 1), "which we properly term His body mystical can be but one, neither can that one be sensibly discerned by any man. . . . . Only our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend that such a real body there is; a body collective, because it containeth a huge multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense. Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love and saving mercy which God showeth towards His Church, the only proper subject thereof is this Church. . . . . They who are of this society have such marks and notes of distinction from all others as are not objects unto our sense: only unto God who seeth their hearts and understanding, all their secret cogitations, unto Him they are clear and manifest. . . . . And as those everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness belong to the mystical Church; even so, on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. . . . . For lack of diligently observing the difference, first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between the visible, sound, and corrupted,—sometimes more, sometimes less,—the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed."

Speaking from our own experience, it seems as if this question, "What is the Church which has the promises?" ranks second to none in our day. Whatever may first have shaken the faith of an English Churchman, the points to which he comes, or to which Roman argument brings him, seem generally to be such as these.

1st. The Church contemplated by Christ, and instituted by the Apostles, is a visible institution. Such it was made; such it continues.

2nd. This Church possesses the great and inalienable promises of its blessed Founder and Head.

3rd. This Church, then, is visible; a great and mighty institution: I must be able to discern it. It must have a continuous history and existence: where is it?

4th. I see the Church of Rome, visible, historical, continuous. That which I seek is there, or it is (which God forbid) nowhere.

And so the belief in the visible Church, as the heir of all the promises, is laid firmly as the foundation. That once accomplished, infallibility, Church teaching, whether on the sacraments or other matters, seem seldom to present many difficulties. This may be illustrated from the replies of Dr. Newman and Cardinal

Digitized by Google

Manning in the Gladstone controversy. When we read their discordant opinions, their opposing expositions of Roman doctrine, we inquire what common principle underlies their statements so as to make them both obedient servants of the Roman Church. We find it is this belief in the one visible Church, the possessor of the promises. And so it will be found in what may be called the drawing-room controversy of the present day, which has wrought such havoc in families. There may be difficulties of various kinds,—difficulties about sacraments, about the use of Scripture, about saint worship, and many other things; but either Manning or Capel will for the most part insist on setting these aside, and forcing to the front this other question, "What is the true Church? What is that Church which possesses the promises, which can show an unbroken history, and has a rightful claim to obedience?" Seldom has the victim knowledge of Scripture enough to break the first link of the evidence, or knowledge of history to show that the continuity is little more than a chain of elaborate forgery.

That fatal dogma of the Oxford school, of the Church visible being the heir of the promises, has been the baneful root of a large part of our recent sufferings in the Church of England. It needs to be met with clear systematic teaching: it meets us everywhere. In a recent public examination on the thirty-nine Articles, this was one of the questions, "Show from Scripture that the Church of Christ was intended to be a *visible* (*sic*) body of believers." Thus it is that the almost unanimous teaching of our old divines is cast away, and a principle enunciated which logically leads to Rome, whither it has already led thousands.

We venture, therefore, to urge the necessity for clear teaching on the nature of the Church of the promises. We do not mean protests, or denunciations, or occasional lectures, but steady Bible teaching, that shall lay strong foundations and build up believers in the truth of God.

We need not be afraid of being called "Low Churchmen." There is no reason why we should not have that much-abused thing, "sound Church principles." No doubt there are promises, and a presence of Christ with His visible Church. Yet these are all limited and modified with a view to His Church mystical, which, all unseen, is nurtured and matured within the bosom of the Church visible. It is only because of this that the latter has any hold upon the promise. "The everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness (to repeat Hooker's language) belong to the mystical Church." This alone is eternal. All outward Churches must pass away. The day must come when the most eminent Episcopal throne shall crumble into the dust of nothingness. But then the one Church shall still survive, even "the

Digitized by Google

general assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven."

Only so far as we order all our efforts in the development of the visible Church so as to make it the more fertile seed-plot, wherein may spring up and flourish the members of the mystical body of Christ, can we have any grasp of the promises.

May God so guide the great spiritual movements amongst us, that it may be manifest that the Lord is truly present. So the promise of the New Testament shall meet the promise of the Old,—and "the name of the city from that day shall be Jehovah-Shammah: the Lord is there."

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. III.

(1) *The Sin-offering.*

THE offerings which we have hitherto been considering had not formally to do with *sin;* this, though implied in the very nature of atonement, was not brought prominently forward in connection with them. They were rather intended to teach the acceptance of the person of man by God through the appointed medium of priest and offering. But we now have to consider the rite prescribed for those who had broken any of God's commandments, and who were thus offenders against the law.

Sin was regarded in various aspects under the Jewish law. In some cases it was an offence against man as well as against God. It then called for a double remedy. There must be, not only atonement with respect to God, but also compensation to the injured party according to the requirements of the case. This compensation was quite as imperative as any other part of the law, and no amount of ritual observance could be a substitute for it.

Again, sin against God might be either a presumptuous and deliberate defiance of the divine ordinances; or it might be an offence against God's moral law, through ignorance, error, and the infirmity of nature; or it might be an offence against the ceremonial law. These cases were differently dealt with. For the deliberate and presumptuous offender there was no remedy, no sacrifice for sin. The law held out no hope to such an one. "The soul that doeth ought presumptuously (literally with a high hand), whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same reproacheth (or blasphemeth[a]) the Lord. And that soul

[a] The Hebrew word is a very strong one, and is hardly ever used except of blasphemy against God.

Digitized by Google

shall be cut off from among His people. Because he hath despised the Word of the Lord, and hath broken His commandment, that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him." (Num. xv. 30, 31.) An illustration of this principle is conveyed in the verses that immediately follow, where we have the account of the stoning of the man who was gathering sticks on the Sabbath. The death of the wilful and incorrigible son is another case (Lev. xxiv. 10—16); and generally, wherever death is the penalty, it will be found that the sin committed was one of very deep dye, and implied that the offender was hopelessly corrupt.

It is in accordance with this general principle, that while David prays to be *cleansed* from errors and secret faults, he asks to be *kept back* from presumptuous sins, from which there could be no cleansing. (Ps. xix. 12, 13.) It may be with reference to this class of sin that Eli said to his sons, "If one man sin against another the judge shall judge him; but if a man sin against the Lord, who shall intreat for him?" (1 Sam. ii. 25.)

It is important to bear in mind that the Jews were aware of this distinction between sins of frailty and presumptuous sins, when we come to consider certain passages in the New Testament. Thus in Matt. xii. 31, the Lord, after announcing that pardon was to be obtained for all manner of sin and blasphemy, added, that "the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." Again, in Heb. x. 28, etc., we are told, that "He that *despised* (or, *set at naught*) Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses;" and the writer adds, "of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace."

One can hardly understand in what sense the holders of the annihilation theory can accept such words as these. Nothing is more clear than that as there were presumptuous sins for which there was no remission under the old dispensation, so there is a deliberate and defiant rejection of God's grace for which there is a far sorer punishment than death under the new dispensation; and the principle foreshadowed under the law of Moses will be carried out in all its terrible reality in the day of "the wrath of the Lamb."

But the case of *error* or *ignorance* (for they are the same word in the original) is different. Such error was the result of want of training, or of inattention, or of carelessness, or of sudden temptation; it showed that the offender was brutish, ignorant of the full bearing of what he was doing, acting upon the spur of the moment, and yielding to animal instincts without thinking

Digitized by Google

of the fact that such a course was in reality rebellion against the Most High. For such sins there was a remedy. God knew the people's frailty; He remembered that they were but dust; and it was the very business of the high priest to show by his ministrations that God had compassion on the ignorant and on those that were out of the way, and that if those who had offended would only turn to the Lord and confess their sins, and seek His grace in the appointed method, they would be accepted and their sins would be blotted out.

Sins of this class were dealt with differently, according to the position of the offender. In Num. xv. 22, etc., we read, "If ye have *erred*, and not observed all these commandments, which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses; then it shall be, if ought be committed by ignorance (or *in error*) by the congregation without their knowledge, that all the congregation shall offer one young bullock for an ascending-offering for a sweet savour unto the Lord, with a meat-offering, and drink-offering, and also one kid of the goats for a sin-offering. And the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and it shall be forgiven them, for it is ignorance (or error). And if any soul sin through ignorance (or error), then he shall bring a she-goat of the first year for a sin-offering, and the priest shall make atonement, and it shall be forgiven him."

The full details of the rite are given in Leviticus iv., and chap. v. to verse 13. Where the whole congregation (including the priest), or where the priest alone had sinned, a bullock was the appointed victim. In these cases, forasmuch as the ministering priest was involved in the offence there was no one who could eat any part of the flesh as God's representative. Consequently the whole victim, with the exception of the fat, was carried outside the camp and burnt up or utterly consumed. Thus it was not turned to vapour on the altar. As for the blood, some of it was dropped with the finger before the veil seven times; some was applied to the horns of the altar of incense in the holy place, and the rest was poured out on the earth at the base of the brazen altar. Where the offender was a ruler the sin-offering was a male kid without blemish; and in the case of a common person, a female kid or lamb was the appointed victim; in those instances we are not told that any of the blood was brought into the holy place to be dropped on the veil, or on the incense altar, but a little was put on the horns of the brazen altar, the rest being poured out at its base. The body was regarded as sacred, and was eaten by the priest in the holy place.[b] This priestly act of eating was one part of God's method

[b] Or rather in *a* holy place: *i.e.*, within the sacred precincts.

Digitized by Google

of exhibiting that He had accepted the offering. (See Lev. vi. 25—30; and x. 17.) It also perhaps prefigured that identification of the priest with the victim which is fulfilled in Christ.

It is evident that there was a broad distinction between the ascending-offering and the sin-offering. The one set forth the acceptance of the offerer by God, through his identification with an appointed victim, which was slain and then was caused to ascend in a cloud of vapour by the action of the priest: the other set forth the consumption of sin by a Divinely prescribed agency, of which the peculiar feature was that the victim which represented the offerer's sin was burnt up without the camp, if the priest was offering for himself, and was eaten up by the priest in all other cases. When the priest offered for himself the only altar which bore the marks of blood was the altar of incense, and with that he was not to be a partaker. The body of the beast whose blood touched that altar was burnt. When the offerer was not the ministering priest the outer altar only bore the marks of blood; and in that case the body was eaten. But the blood did not ascend in acceptable vapour in either case. Sin was to be *consumed*, either by the fire or by the priest, and the greater part of the blood was to enter into the dust, as the blood of righteous Abel had done.

Instances of the sort of sin which made a man guilty, and consequently called for the presentation of a sin-offering, are given in the early part of the fifth of Leviticus. First comes the case of a man who refuses to speak to what he has seen when solemnly adjured. Then follow cases of ceremonial defilement. Then we have the case of a man who, after swearing to do a thing, fails to fulfil his oath through ignorance or negligence. In each case, when the sin was brought to his knowledge, he was to regard himself as *asham*, or guilty, and his duty was to *confess*. But to whom? Here the Mosaic code is silent (Lev. v. 5). There is no instruction given to the Israelite on this point. He was not told to confess to the priest. Practically he might often have done so; but the general teaching of Scripture is that confession is to be made to the offended party, from whom alone forgiveness can come. Accordingly the Psalmist says (xxxii. 5), "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." And again, earlier in the same verse, "I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid." Compare also the fifty-first Psalm. Sometimes sin against the Lord was brought to a man's knowledge through a prophet or a priest, and then naturally the conscience-stricken man poured forth his confession into the ear of the person whom God had used in convicting him of his wrong-doing; but it is clear that directions for anything like

Digitized by Google

"auricular confession" to the priest are not to be found in the law of the Lord, and do not form part of the sacerdotal system prescribed to the Jews.

Some additional particulars are given with respect to the sin-offering in Lev. vi. 25—30, where we read, "In the place where the burnt or ascending-offering is killed shall the sin-offering be killed before the Lord: it is most holy. The priest that offereth -it-for-sin (literally 'makes it sin' or 'causes it to be a sin-offering') shall eat it: in the (or rather *a*) holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation. Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy: and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof on any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place (*i.e.*, in the court of the tabernacle, as above). But the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden shall be broken: and if it be sodden in a brazen pot, it shall be both scoured and rinsed in water. All the males among the priests shall eat thereof: it is most holy. But no sin-offering whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to make atonement in the holy place shall be eaten: it shall be burnt up in the fire."

Such were the very special charges relative to the sin-offering, all tending to impress the mind with the exceeding sinfulness of sin, with the defilement which it involves, with the necessity of an atonement, and with the completeness of that atonement which God was typifying by the work of the priest, who, after sprinkling a few drops of the blood according to the requirements of each case, was either to eat the slain victim (in conjunction with his fellow priests) or, where the offence to be atoned for involved either his own sin or the sin of the whole congregation, to burn the body without the camp.

(2) *Other References to Sin-offerings.*

Sin-offerings are very rarely mentioned in the later books of the Old Testament. We read in 2 Chron xxix. 21 that when Hezekiah cleansed the Temple, he and the rulers "brought seven bullocks and seven lambs (for a burnt-offering), and seven he-goats for a sin-offering, for the kingdom and for the sanctuary and for Judah. And he commanded the priests to offer them (*i.e.*, the burnt-offerings) on the altar of the Lord. So they (the rulers) killed the bullocks, and the priests received the blood and sprinkled it on the altar: likewise when they had killed the rams they sprinkled the blood upon the altar. Then they brought the he-goats for a sin-offering before the King and the congregation, and they pressed their hands upon them: and the priests killed them, and they made reconciliation with their blood

Digitized by Google

upon the altar (literally, 'dealt with it as *sin* with reference to the altar'), so as to make an atonement for all Israel: for the King commanded that the burnt-offering and the sin-offering should be made (*i.e.*, offered) for all Israel." The Hebrew ritual terms are here used with great exactness, though it is not easy to reproduce them in English. The punctuation of our Authorized Version is not quite accurate, as it would cause a reader at first to suppose the bullocks and rams were part of the sin-offering, which was not the case. At the re-dedication of the Temple (Ezra vi. 17) twelve he-goats were offered for a sin-offering, according to the number of the tribes of Israel. See also chap. viii. 35.

Sin-offerings were offered with ascending-offerings after childbirth (Lev. xii. 6), and in the case of purification from an issue (Lev. xv. 29). Under these circumstances a pigeon or a turtle-dove was the appointed victim. In the case of the cleansing of a leper there was not only the singular rite of the dipping a living bird in the blood of the dead and liberating it, but also there was a guilt-offering of a male lamb, some of whose blood was to be put on the ear, thumb, and great toe of the healed man, oil afterwards being put on the same places. Thus a male lamb was to be offered for a sin-offering, and a ewe lamb of the first year for an ascending-offering, together with a meat-offering, the "memorial" of which would be burnt. The amount offered might, however, be modified if the healed man was poor, but the characteristic rites remained the same.

(3) *The Day of Atonement.*

The rites on the great Day of Atonement were the most remarkable of all, and they are studied by the Christian with additional interest owing to the fact that their most peculiar feature was one specially significant of the work of our Lord and Saviour.

The various offerings which we have been considering had two great defects in them. The first was that they needed constant repetition; the second was that they did not penetrate within the veil. The very utmost that was done was this,—that in the case of the sin-offering of a bullock for the priest and for the congregation, a few drops of the blood were let fall on the veil, as if the sinner were yearning for nearer communion with God and for a more full sense of pardon and acceptance. Once a year, however, a rite was performed which indicated the imperfection and the consequent cessation of the continual offerings, and which set forth in symbol the withdrawing of that veil which had separated man from his Maker. The full

Digitized by Google

account of this rite is to be found in the sixteenth of Leviticus, a chapter which deserves the most careful study. After certain ceremonial washings, the high priest, having been divested of his gorgeous ephod and his blue or purple robe, and being clad in pure linen, was to take a bullock for a sin-offering for himself and his house, but instead of dropping a little of its blood on the veil, he was to penetrate within, enveloped in a cloud of incense, and there,—in the most holy place, which represented God's presence-chamber,—he was to let drops of blood fall from his finger upon the eastern side of the mercy-seat,—that is, the side nearest to himself,—and also on the ground immediately in front of it. He was then to do the same thing with the blood of a kid which had been selected as a sin-offering for the people. This act was to be regarded as something more than an ordinary sin-offering. It constituted an atonement for the most holy place, and the people were taught that such an atonement was needed "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins." God's dwelling-place amongst men had become polluted by their sins, and needed to be cleansed or atoned for by blood. Further, this cleansing atonement was to be effected for the whole tabernacle and for the brazen altar, by the sprinkling of some of the blood upon them. Thus the object of this part of the ordinance was not only to set forth the pardon of man, but also to indicate that a means was to be found which should justify God in pitching His tabernacle among sinners and in passing by their disobedience from year to year.

But the whole rite was not yet accomplished. Two kids had been presented before the Lord, and they exhibited two distinct aspects of God's atoning work. The second had now to be dealt with. Aaron was to press both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and then to send him forth into the wilderness. "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited" (literally, a land of separation). Thus whilst the ordinary offerings, which were to be done away, set forth atonement through blood-shedding, this rite which, being only once a year, was the type of what was permanent,—once for all,—exhibited the entire liberation of men from all their sins, and the complete separation effected between the people and their offences through the voluntary act of a living sin-bearer.

(4) *The Guilt or Trespass-offering.*

The Hebrew word translated "trespass-offering" is *asham*

Digitized by Google

which is usually rendered "guilty;" it would be more satisfactory therefore if the offering was called a guilt-offering. The distinction between the sin-offering and guilt-offering is not very clear, and commentators, both Jewish and Christian, have given widely different accounts of it. There is no separation, in fact, between a guilty man and a sinner. In the various cases contemplated under the head of the sin-offering,—in all cases, that is to say in which men miss the mark which they ought to hit, and wander into the byeways of error, ignorance, and infirmity,—they are *asham*, or guilty (Lev. iv. 13, 22, 27), and being guilty they must offer a sin-offering. Instances of the kind of thing calling for a sin-offering have already been given; and it has been observed that wherever these sins were brought to a man's knowledge *as sins*, he was to consider himself as *asham*. He was to confess his sin, and to make his offering; and the priest was to make atonement for him, and then he was to regard himself as forgiven.

Thus the idea of *asham* or guilt is not restricted to cases for which an *asham* or guilt-offering was appointed. These we have now to consider. They are contained in the last five verses of Lev. v. and the first seven verses of Lev. vi.; and these passages ought to have been thrown together in our English Bibles as they are in the Hebrew. On examining them, we at once see why the *asham* has been described by our translators as a trespass-offering; it is because in all the cases contemplated the sinner has committed an act of "trespass" against the Lord. The "trespasses" here referred to are of two kinds. First, there are direct trespasses against the Lord in matters of "holy things," that is to say, when certain religious or ceremonial duties and gifts ordered by the Lord to be paid were either neglected altogether, or were insufficiently performed. In these cases a ram was to be offered as an *asham* or guilt-offering, and restitution or amends was to be made in money for whatever was deficient, together with a fifth in addition: this money being paid to the priest. The priest was then to make an atonement with the ram, and the offence committed was to be regarded as forgiven.

The second class of trespasses comprised certain sins against a man's neighbour which were also,—though a man may not have thought of it at the time,—sins against God. Instances of the sort of "trespass" contemplated under this head are given in Lev. vi. 2, 3. They are matters of false dealing or false speaking. In these cases full amends were to be made to the injured party, together with a fifth, and at the same time a ram, and apparently a present of money also were to be offered to the Lord.

Digitized by Google

The word *màal*, which is used in the introduction to these two classes of offences, is translated, "commit a trespass" (Lev. v. 15; vi. 2); and hence it is that our translators have called the offering a trespass-offering, though the Hebrew word for trespass-offering, wherever it occurs, is not *màal*, but *asham*, a guilt-offering. What then, it will be asked, is the idea properly conveyed by this word *màal?* because if we can get hold of this idea we shall see what instruction God intended to convey when He appointed these special offerings. The following extract, which gives the usage of the word *màal* in the Old Testament, will enable us to grasp the idea which underlies the rite of the trespass-offering:—

"The word probably points to the *unfaithfulness* and *treachery* of sin, and represents wrong-doing as a *breach of trust*, whether between man and man, or between man and God. It is rendered 'trespass' about thirty times in the Old Testament; 'transgression,' fifteen times; and 'falsehood,' in Job xxi. 34. In Josh. vii. 11, and xxii. 20, it is used of Achan's sin; the building of the altar on the east of Jordan was also described by this word (Josh. xxii. 16); it is applied to Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 18); to Ahaz (chap. xxviii. 22); to Manasseh (chap. xxxiii. 19); and to the people who married heathen wives (Ezra ix. 2, 4; Neh. xiii. 29). It is found in Prov. xvi. 10, where we read that 'the King's mouth transgresseth not in judgment.' The trespass or breach of trust denoted by this word was regarded by God in a very serious light. (See Ezekiel xiv. 13; xv. 8; xviii. 24; xxxix. 23.) The reason of this is manifest. The persons guilty of sin in this particular aspect were chiefly persons in positions of trust or authority. A certain trust had been imposed upon them, which they had abused. Much had been given to them and much was required of them. The nation of Israel, as a whole, were put in a position of high privilege, and consequently of solemn responsibility; hence their departure from the way of God was marked specially by the word *màal*, as an act of unfaithfulness, and as a breach of a bond no less holy and close than that which subsists between a man and his wife." [c]

Thus, while the Hebrew word for "sin" signifies a coming short of our true destiny, the word for "trespass" indicates man's unfaithfulness to the trust which God has committed to him. In each case a remedy was to be looked for, under the Jewish law, not from the ingenuity of man, but from the undeserved favour and boundless wisdom of God.

Some additional particulars are given with respect to the guilt or trespass-offering in Lev. vii. 1—7, where we read, "This is the law of the guilt-offering: it is most holy. In the place where they kill the ascending-offering shall they kill the guilt-

[c] "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 135.

Digitized by Google

offering; and the blood thereof shall he (*i.e.*, the priest) sprinkle round about upon the altar. And he shall offer of it all the fat thereof; the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the flanks, and the caul that is above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall be taken away; and the priest shall burn them (or turn them to vapour) upon the altar for an offering made by fire unto the Lord: it is a guilt-offering. Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it shall be eaten in the (or *a*) holy place: it is most holy. As the sin-offering, so is the guilt-offering: there is one law for them: the priest that maketh atonement therewith shall have it."

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

"L' ANTICHRIST," PAR ERNEST RENAN.

REVIEW OF RENAN, in October No. of EDINBURGH REVIEW, 1874.

Supernatural Religion. Fourth Edition. Second Volume.

LETTER III.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Christian Observer and Advocate.*

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—There remains yet another testing by which, as intimated in my last letter, to show yet further the self-refuting absurdity of Renan's and his admiring Reviewer's Apocalyptic theory: viz., by reference to the fact that it involves a view of much the larger part of its visions as practically a mere meaningless excrescence of the Apocalyptic book. Not indeed that any additional proof of it is needed; but because the boastful holding forth of the theory as if demonstrably true by many, like the Edinburgh Reviewer, of the sceptical school in England, as well as by others in Germany and elsewhere, seems to render the exposure of its falsehood in *every* point of view most desirable and important.

It is the notion of M. Renan, as we have seen, that the Apocalypse was a kind of "*Manifesto*" by St. John, at the opening of the year 69 A.D., to the Asiatic Churches that looked to him as their head:—a Manifesto of warning and hate against *Nero*, on his expected restoration to the Roman Emperorship, as the great destined *external* enemy of the Christian Church before Christ's second coming, indeed the very *Antichrist;* and against St. Paul, and his anti-Judaizing disciples, as the great existing *internal* enemy. On the supposition of truth in which hypothesis it could not be surely but that the Apostolic author

Digitized by Google

of the Manifesto, terribly earnest as he is declared to have been in the matter,[a] and well able, as "one of the foremost men of the time,"[b] most effectively to give expression to his intentions, would frame his professedly inspired communication from heaven to the Churches accordingly: pointedly and at once, after the anti-Pauline denunciations, proceeding (like as in the great prototype of Daniel's visions) to exhibit symbolically in all his hateful bestiality, and with suitable words of instruction and warning, the Beast Nero, on his now from day to day expected reappearance in the character of Antichrist, and shrinking instinctively from all surplusage of word, or symbol, or other extraneous matter, such as might serve to distract the minds of the disciples addressed, and so deaden the force of his warning voice. How then in this respect is the Apocalyptic document found to answer to M. Renan's theory?

Turning to the Book itself for an answer to this question, it seems hardly consistent, even *primâ facie*, with any such anticipation, that not less than 8 chapters should intervene between the supposed *anti-Pauline* Epistles to the seven Churches and the chapter which first exhibits a bestial symbolization introductory to that of the coming Antichrist; viz., from chap. ii. to chap. xi., inclusive. Nor, looking more particularly to the figurative visions themselves in those chapters, shall we find anything to alter that our first impression.

The visions, it may be premised, are constructed evidently on a closely connected and well considered plan of arrangement. This is marked on the pages of the written Book itself by seven successive separating Seals, which allow of one only, and its corresponding vision, being unfolded on the opening of each seal, in its own order of succession. Then, after the opening of the seventh of those seals, there follow a new sevenfold series of visions, heralded in by the sounding successively of seven Trumpets, on the Apocalyptic scene of vision. On the forefront of which scene, moreover, there appears throughout a temple, with triple divisions of altar-court, holy place, and holy of holies, resembling those of the Temple at Jerusalem (though with antitypical Christian meaning,[c] like as in certain Old Testament visions), which is associated with the figurations in the several visions, as if to give unity to the whole, and yet further to point in each case their significance. So from chap.

[a] "A book (the Apocalypse) breathing in every page the most intense conviction and passion." .... "The work of an enthusiast transported with hatred ('haine terrible,') against the Roman Empire, etc."—*Edinburgh Review*, 488, 9.

[b] Ibid.

[c] As shown in my first letter. So in Isaiah vi. And see, too, Heb. ix., etc.

Digitized by Google

iii. to xi., as was said, inclusive. After which begins that other series of symbolizations which bears more directly on the subject of the Beast, Antichrist:—a series running on in the written record (with certain parentheses) from chap. xii. to chap. xix., in which last the destruction of the Beast is announced; and of which the main general topic of Antichrist is very curiously intertwined in chronological parallelism with that of certain of the preceding Trumpet visions, by the involvment alike in the one and in the other of that remarkable period of the 1,260 days 42 months, or 3½ times, which was first predicted by Daniel as the destined period in power of the little horn of the fourth Beast, *i.e.* Antichrist.

Now the more carefully (one might almost say *artistically*) that these successive series of visions are connected together in arrangement, as well as the more elaborate the details of their several symbolisms, the more, surely, one might expect that *by the real author* they were intended to bear effectively on the main objects in his mind when planning the book; that is, on M. Renan's Apocalyptic theory (in so far as regards the chapters following after the supposed anti-Pauline Epistles to the seven Churches), on Nero, the terrible expected Antichrist. But what, on Renan's own showing, is the purport of all the intervening symbolizations in vision of both Seals and Trumpets, down to the end of chap. xi. of the Apocalyptic book?—To begin, they are introduced by the announcement, as if from Christ Himself (Apoc. iv. 1), that they were meant to symbolize to the Church events of the afterward coming *future;* whereas Renan openly professes that in his explanation he interprets them all of things of the *past;*[d] and this without consciousness apparently on his part of there being anything wrong, or absurd, in such flagrant inconsistency between it and Christ's introductory announcement. Then, as to the several symbolizations in particular, they seem in his view to have had about as little relevancy to what he sets forth as the great Apocalyptic subject, and object, as might the phantasmagoria of dissolving views such as are now-a-days exhibited by itinerant showmen or lecturers.—Let us just fancy that the magic lantern, with its slides, had been a device known at Rome in the time of the Emperor Galba; and that some Christianized Roman or Jew, indoctrinated with M. Renan's notions, had officiated then and there as St. John's appointed expounder of picturings[e] on the slides like to those of the Apocalyptic Seals and Trumpets, before some little similarly composed

[d] "Les six premières trompettes, comme les ouvertures des six premiers sceaux, se rapportent à des faits qui etaient passés quand l'auteur écrivait."—Renan, p. 400.

[e] Renan and his sceptica brethren often speak of the Apostle John's *secretary*.

Digitized by Google

gathering of Christian converts,—what, let me ask, according to Renan's exposition before us, would have been his explanations? On Seal 1: "There," he would have said, "behold figured by the rider on the white horse, with a bow, the conquering *Roman Emperors*, in their progress of eastward victory even to Judæa;" interrupted, however, probably by some less unlearned auditor, with the question, "How Roman Emperors, when with so un-Roman a weapon in hand as a *bow?*" And then Seal 2: "In the rider of the red horse, with a great sword in hand, as if to take peace from the earth, see symbolized *war*,—cruel *war*,—such as has been going on in the Roman world ever since the Emperor Nero's death." And again, Seal 3: "In the rider with a pair of balances in hand, on the black horse, addressed from the throne of power with the words, 'A chœnix of wheat for a denarius, and three chœnixes of barley for a denarius, and see that thou injure not the oil and the wine,' behold *famine* figured;—a plague such as befel the empire some twenty years ago, in the reign of Claudius." "But how real famine," might whisper audibly the same interrupting voice again; "with barley-bread at so low a price as three chœnixes, or six lbs. for a denarius;—that is, three days sufficiency of bread-stuff for a single day's usual labour wage, and undiminished abundance moreover of wine and oil?" Put out by which second interruption we may imagine the lecturer to hasten on, without explanatory word, over Seal 4, and its figured consummating plague of *Death* on the pale horse, having commission to kill, though with strange restrictedness to but one fourth part of the Roman world, by all the combining agencies of war, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts:[f]—also over Seal 5, figuring the souls of Christian martyrs, such as those slain A.D. 64 at Rome by Nero, crying out for vengeance against their murderers; and the 6th Seal's vision, also, in which every elemental convulsion seemed depicted, as of the last judgment day; though only so as to excite expectation the lecturer might just observe in passing; the real fact being a putting off indefinitely of Christ's day of vengeance against the Church's persecutors.[g]

Thus, I say, we may suppose the lecturer to hurry on to the more convenient picturings, for his purpose, of the Trumpets; and that then, on the first Trumpet's sounding, he thus resumes:—

"In the here figured hailstorm, the hail running mixed with fire

[f] So Renan, p. 386, giving simply the Apocalyptic verse.

[g] "Nous rentrons au milieu des phénomènes du dernier jugement. 'A l' ouverture du sixième sceau a eu lieu un grand tremblement de l' univers . . . . La grande execution va donc s' accomplir. Mais l' idée fondamentale du poème est de montrer le grand jugement sans cesse ajourné au moment où il semblait qu' il dût avoir lieu." Pp. 388, and 391.

Digitized by Google

and blood on the ground, see a reference to the storms of something like supernatural violence by which quite recently in the years 63 and 68, as we Christians reckon time, [h] the country has been desolated. In the second Trumpet's great burning mountain cast into the sea, with destructive effect wherever the burning ashes fall, behold an allusion to the volcanic eruptions of the isle of Thera; a volcano almost visible, with reflexion of its flames on the waves, from our Apostle's late place of banishment in Patmos. Then again, on the third Trumpet's sounding, in the burning star pictured in vision as falling on river-fountains, and poisoning them, see a reference to the fall with poisoning effect on certain river-heads of those burning aerolites that have been of late talked of so much as of evil omen in the Asiatic province: and in the eclipses of sun, moon, and stars under the fourth Trumpet an allusion to certain late natural eclipses similarly portentous of evil. [i] Yet further, in the fifth Trumpet's locusts, let loose as out of the abyss of hell, see depicted the locust plague which at times ravages, as the rumour is, some Italian districts; emerging from volcanic exhalations like those of the Solfaterra at Puteoli." [j]

So speaks the lecturer: and then, as the magic lantern's last slide is introduced, and when, on the sixth Trumpet sounding, there appears before the auditory a picturing of cavalry hordes, fearfully fire-breathing, as it would seem, from their mouths, we may suppose that with bated breath the apostle's Renan-taught deputy thus whispers; "Here behold pictured what we are expecting, as even now actually imminent,—viz., a terrible invasion of Parthian horsemen from the Euphrates, with a view, perhaps, to restore to the imperial throne that horrid persecuting Beast Nero"! [k]

In the above I believe I have not unfairly sketched M. Renan's explanation of the successive septenaries of the Apocalyptic visions of the Seals and Trumpets. And, thus explained, can we make out any relevancy in them (that of the sixth Trumpet alone excepted), to the second grand supposed object of St. John's Apocalyptic Manifesto; or think it possible that if in earnestness of spirit he had so intended it, he would have encumbered the Manifesto with visions and explanations so irrelevant, so distracting to the disciples of the seven churches, indeed so childish and absurd?

Nor, in truth, is it in these alone that we have to mark the irrelevancy of sundry of the figurations, on Renan's Neronic Antichrist hypothesis,[l] in so far as regards the possibility of his furnishing any really applicable explanation to it of the symbols

[h] I take the liberty of thus anticipatively using the Christian era.

[i] Ibid pp. 393—395. [j] Ibid pp. 396-7. [k] P. 398.

[l] "La Bête de l'abîme est la puissance Romaine, ou plutôt Neron reparaissant en Antichrist. P. 402.

Digitized by Google

from the history of the times. So, *e.g.*, even in reference to the two most prominent characters connected in quite different ways with the Beast Antichrist in the Apocalypse; viz., the Beast's chief helping agent for evil, and the Beast's chief victim.

(1) The Beast Antichrist's grand agent for deceit and evil, as figured in the Apocalypse (Apoc. xiii.), is a second smaller wolfish wild beast, disguised by a two-horned lamb-skin covering, and called elsewhere (Apoc. xix. 20) the False Prophet.[m] As to this *False Prophet*, then, or second *smaller wolfish* Beast, who, asks Renan, quite puzzled, can he have been? "Qu'est ce que la seconde Bête, cet agent de Neron?" (p. 417.) First, says he, we are led to think of *Simon Magus*, whom the legend speaks of as coming to Rome in the reign of Nero. Or perhaps the party meant may have been *Balbillus* of Ephesus; or perhaps that Antichrist (different from Nero) that had been predicted by St. Paul in 2 Thess. ii.[n] Most probably, however, he may have been some Ephesian impostor known to St. John as a partizan of Nero; perhaps an agent of the false Nero, the impostor who at this very time (a fact again to be much noted) came to the Isle of Cyphnos, giving himself out as Nero the late Emperor; or perhaps that impostor himself. "But in truth," concludes our expositor, "the point is obscure, and one cannot remove the obscurity. It must remain for us an enigma." (pp. 419—422.)—So as to one absolutely essential characteristic of the Beast Antichrist, in the Apocalypse, St. John's supposed Manifesto against Nero.

(2) And then as to *Christ's two witnesses*, whose murder by the Beast, revival after 3½ days lying corpse-like, and subsequent ascension to heaven, is so prominent an event in the Apocalyptic description,—who are they? Perhaps, says Renan (p. 403), the allusion is to *Enoch* and *Elias;* or, according to some resemblances, perhaps to *Moses* and *Jeremiah*. But indeed seemingly, he adds, they might rather be supposed two Apostles of pre-eminent sanctity slain at Jerusalem. If so, then, in retrospective view, St. John may have had in his mind *John Baptist* and *Jesus Christ;* or perhaps *the two James'*, those universally esteemed Apostles of Jesus Christ, slain there.—As to the 3½ days' exposure of the corpses of the two slain witnesses, and then and thereupon their sudden resurrection and ascension to heaven,—on these essential points in the Apocalyptic description, just as on the Antichrist's own Apocalyptically predicted 1,260 days of royal power, Renan, I think, says nothing.

---

[m] Just as Matt. vii. 15.

[n] "On a l' Antichrist dont parla obscurement Paul dans la deuxième epitre aux Thessaloniens." (p. 420.) The reader will here observe Renan's recognition of the 2nd Thessalonians as one of St. Paul's epistles.

Digitized by Google

Now, considering the multitudinous series of self-refuting false statements and absurdities which I have thus shown to attach to Renan's scheme of Apocalyptic date and interpretation, especially in regard of what concerns the Beast Antichrist, might it not well seem marvellous, even on the hypothesis of the Book being one of mere human composition by an able and earnest Christian Apostle in Galba's reign, that such interpretation should ever have been imagined as credible by a single man of sense? How much more marvellous that it should not only have been imagined, but set forth as undoubtedly true, by not one only like the Edinburgh Reviewer,[o] after Renan, but many professed critics in Germany, France, and England! Thus in a number of the *Saturday Review*, now before me, I see a laudatory notice of a lately published work of Hilgenfeld, assigning the same Neronic or Galbaic date to the Apocalypse; and by consequence substantially, I suppose, the same interpretation to the Book (especially in regard of the Antichrist), as by M. Renan, and the earlier German sceptics whom Renan has followed. The same as regards Volkmar. The same as regards the author of "Supernatural Religion," who gives us a somewhat elaborate notice of the Apocalypse in his second volume.—Now, were judgment as to the truth or falsehood of this date and interpretation to be decided simply by the internal test of its possible consistency with the other Apocalyptic visions themselves,—quite independently of the palpable failure of all other suggested evidence in its favour,—I cannot but think that the mere sight of a schedule of Renan's solutions, on this hypothesis, of the Apocalyptic visions of Seals, Trumpets, the lesser wolfish Beast, and the two witnesses slain by Antichrist, such as we have seen them to be, drawn out in chronological order, would suffice to disabuse its advocates of all belief in it. Let the reader carefully inspect the one appended. The test of such a schedule is of course generally applicable. And, while very simple, it may further be not a little decisive as to the truth or untruth of the main principle advocated in their expositions by Apocalyptic expositors of very various schools of interpretation. But, whether consciously or unconsciously, the testing seems to be by most shrunk from with a kind of instinctive fear.[p]

But in fact, sad to say, it is almost impossible not to see that

[o] "No reasonable man can doubt, we think, that we have here a true key to the interpretation of the Apocalypse."—*Edinburgh Review*, p. 495.

[p] Could my excellent friend, the Rev. C. J. Goodhart, have published his little volume entitled "Coming Events and the Coming King," with the notice respecting the Apocalyptic Seals and Trumpets which I see at p. 143, had he appended a schedule such as the above as his frontispiece to the volume? Might he not have been led thereby to suspect the fundamental principle about the Beast and Babylon on which his interpretation turns? and

Digitized by Google

RENAN'S APOCALYPTIC SCHEME.

A.D.	Emperors.	Seals.	Trumpets.	Antichrist.	False Prophet.	Two Witnesses.	A.D.
40	Claudius.	i. Course of Roman Emperors' Victories.	Allusion to		Allusion Perhaps to Simon Magus.	Query. Allusion to Christ and John Baptist or to Enoch and Elias? or to	40
45			ii. Volcano in Thera, about 46 or 47 A.D.		Perhaps to St. Paul's Man of Sin, 2 Thess. ii. 3.	James the Great, slain A.D. 44; and	45
50		iii. Famine under Claudius (about 50 A.D.) or Scarcity, A.D. 68.					50
55	Nero (54 A.D.)		iii. Fall of Aerolites.				55
60		iv. Query?	iv. Eclipses and Falling Stars.				60
		v. Christian Martyrs. (A.D. 64.)	i. Hail-storms. (about this time.)		Perhaps to an Ephesian impostor friendly to the pseudo-Nero.		
65		ii. Civil Wars on Nero's Death.	v. Locust swarms, as from volcano.		Perhaps to that impostor himself.	James the Less, slain about A.D. 66?	65
	Galba.	vi. Convulsions as of Judgment day.	vi. Expected Parthian Invasion.				
70		69 A.D. Supposed date of writing of the Apocalypse by St. John.					70
				NERO, restored, the ANTICHRIST.			

Digitized by Google

the judgment of many, if not most, of this class of interpreters on the point in question, and on others more or less connected with it, is fatally biassed by a strongly cherished inclination, not to say determination, to reject everything of the supernatural from the history of primitive Christianity. Hence their general *à priori* philosophical objections against the possibility of real miracles; and rejection of the documentary evidence of our New Testament Gospels, from their asserted lateness of date (some say,[p] not till the end of the first century), as insufficient to substantiate those ascribed to Jesus Christ; the greatest of all, that of His resurrection, inclusive. Hence, further, their rejection of all Christian evidence of divinely-inspired and fulfilled prophecies of the coming future in our New Testament Books; in order whereto they postpone the date of the three synoptic Gospels, Luke's inclusive, which record Christ's wonderful prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, till at least after that event's occurrence. Though, indeed, St. Luke's Gospel has internal evidence of date, as before St. Paul's martyrdom, A.D. '65 or '66, and several years therefore before the Jewish war, such as in regard of other documents they themselves rest on as decisive;[q] and although, moreover, Christ's prophecy, as there recorded, has two most important particulars in it, the fulfilment of which, instead of being limited to the destruction of, Jerusalem was to go on, and has gone on, for 1,700 or 1,800 years since these sceptics' own date of the writing of St.

which indeed rests on the erroneous idea of Rome being set forth under the one view of *Rome Papal*, not under the two distinct views (1) of *Rome Pagan and Imperial;* (2) of Rome *Papal?*

So, too, as to the Apocalyptic commentary of another Christian friend, Mr. William Kelly; and so, as I have shown in my "Apocalypsis Alfordiana," as to that by Dean Alford, etc., etc. Much the same as to Dr. Pusey's exposition of the cognate prophecy in Dan. vii.

[p] Renan, however, at p. ix. of his Introduction, seems to allow the date of the *Acts* as before A.D. 69. Whence necessarily, as shown in my next Note, the prior date of St. Luke's Gospel.

[q] The Apocalyptic statement about the Beast's seven heads in Apoc. xvii., "Of which five have fallen, and one (the sixth) is,"—explained as it is by these expositors of individual Roman emperors,—is their main evidence for the Galbaic date of the Apocalypse; Galba being supposed the 6th. Again, the date of Book v. of the Sibylline poems, as about 170, A.D., is inferred by them from its stopping short at Adrian in its enigmatic list of Roman emperors, and hinting at three more as to follow.—Just so the date of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, written by St. Luke, is inferred from its stopping short in its Pauline narrative at the end of the two years of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, as being about that time, or A.D. 61; and, from what Luke expressly says in Acts i. 1, the date of his first historic book (τον πρωτον λογον) viz., his Gospel, as yet earlier.—The word λόγος evidently implies, let it be further well observed, a complete book.—It is almost as surprising to me as painful to see, in the report of a sermon lately preached by him in London, Professor Jowett's expressed concurrence on the asserted fact of the late date of the Gospels with the sceptical school I am referring to.

Digitized by Google

Luke's Gospel;—"They (the Jews) shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Just in accord with which feeling is the Edinburgh Reviewer's scoffing at all expositions of the Apocalypse (see pp. 485, 511, 513, of the Review), as if in very truth a continuous evolution in its symbolic visions of the chief events and changes in subsequent history of church and world, down even to the present time, just as Christ declared it should be; and this, though in my own exposition, I may say, with strength of proof from coincidence of event and prophecy not a little superior to the miserably insufficient evidence which the Reviewer so applauds in Renan.

Nor indeed does the depreciation of Christian evidence from *miracles*, and *prophecy*, suffice with these sceptics. They must also depreciate the *moral* evidence arising out of the recorded unity in faith and love and holiness of the primitive Christians. In order to which they have seized on the Apocalypse as the very proof they wanted in point. "No doubt," they say, "John the Apostle was its author. But see how it exhibits his bitterness of heart, especially against his brother Apostle St. Paul; and also, in its Judaizing and Ebionistic teachings, a scheme of Christian doctrine absolutely and essentially different from St. Paul's!"

Now of the falsehood of these charges I have spoken cursorily in my second letter. But, having since seen the same charges brought out elsewhere, as on Apocalyptic evidence, against both St. John personally, and primitive Christians and Christianity generally, and half-acquiesced in apparently by some of a very different school,[r] I think it may be well, e're concluding this letter, to show more fully that, instead of St. John's Apocalyptic doctrine

[r] I refer more particularly to a Review of "Supernatural Religion" in last April's No. of the Edinburgh Review. At p. 490 (and so too elsewhere) he seems to admit a continuous difference between St. Paul and the twelve Hebrew and Hebraizing Apostles in regard of Christian doctrine; very much as Renan and the German sceptics speak of the opposite Petrine and Pauline elements of primitive Christianity. A notion to which, as shown above, St. John's Apocalypse, and also St. Peter's 1st Epistle, furnish, as compared with St. Paul's Epistles, the most unequivocal negative.

Two other points occur in this otherwise valuable Paper against which I must here beg to except. 1st, the writer speaks at p. 490 as if the Old Testament Scriptures were alone read in the earliest Christian Church assemblies; whereas St. Paul's own charge, Col. iv. 16, shows that even then *his* (and doubtless other Apostolic) Epistles were also read in them. 2ndly, with not the best taste he speaks at p. 517 "of the scarcely needed inference that *Puritan* views about the New Testament are hopelessly irrational and obsolete; but which do not touch the *Churchman* in any way." Should he not have defined, before so writing, those words of somewhat elastic and variously understood meaning, *Puritan* and *Churchman;* and then have shown wherein, on the question of Christian evidence, the latter would have advantage of the former?

Digitized by Google

differing from St. Paul's, so precisely similar is it with the latter in every essential point of Christian doctrine, that, in so far as *doctrine* is concerned (I do not speak of *style*), it might in all consistency have been written by St. Paul himself.

(1) As concerning *Jesus Christ*, precisely the same view is given of Him by either with regard alike to His divine pre-existence before coming into our world,—His incarnation as of the seed of David,—His sacrificial death antitypically to the sacrifices of the Jewish ceremonial law,—His resurrection, and His ascension to the right hand of the Father; there to act out the part of High Priest and Intercessor, with pleading of His blood-shedding of atonement for His people:—also, as to His being the first fruits, and author to them, of the resurrection after death.

(2) As regards *His people individually*,—their redemption from out of a state of sin and condemnation, and their ultimate salvation,—all this is alike by St. Paul, and in the Apocalypse, ascribed to their washing from sin by application of Jesus Christ's blood of atonement.

(3) By both the one and the other *Christ's Church visible* is represented as consisting of both Israelites and Gentiles; the latter being incorporated into the former so as to form one body (the overlooking of St. Paul's doctrine on which point by M. Renan and his associates has, I think, been one main source of their errors): His Church visible including, however, false Israelites as well as true; the latter being God's election of grace, here sealed by His Spirit, and brought at length out of every nation and tribe and people to heavenly glory.

(4) Further, and as regards the *Church's enemies*, both by the one and by the other warning is given against false Jews, false Apostles: also as to the destined coming of the true Church's most terrible enemy *Antichrist;* his connection with *Rome* being just hinted by St. Paul, as the early Christians understood his words, and plainly stated in the Apocalypse: moreover, how that he would show himself in the temple of God as God (the temple being a term used with Christian meaning alike by St. Paul and in the Apocalypse), and would continue, and work his work of the deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, until destroyed by the brightness of Christ's second personal coming.

(5) Again, and as arising out of this view of Christ's true Church and people as the spiritual Israel, the mother city of their πολιτεια (Phil. iii. 20) is figured both by St. Paul and in the Apocalypse as the *heavenly* Jerusalem, directly in contradistinction to the *earthly* Jerusalem.[s]

(6) In both the Apocalypse and by St. Paul, the looking and

[s] (1) Rev. i. 5, 8, 18; i. 13; iv. 6, etc. Rom. i. 4, 5; Col. i. 13—18, etc.; 1 Cor. xv. 3, etc.; Rom. viii. 34, etc.

Digitized by Google

longing for Christ's speedy coming is connected with a distinct understanding of much to happen before it.

(7) And, seventhly, the blessedness of the saints, when all raised and gathered to Christ on His second coming, is alike by both depicted as, besides freedom from sin, and the curse, and all evil, consisting chiefly of this that they shall walk in the light of the glory of God, and of the Lamb. A new and blessed state of *earth*, as well as a new *heaven* (this is another important point of Apocalyptic and Pauline doctrine too little noted) being the result of Christ's descending with His saints to take the kingdom promised to Him; the nations of them that are saved, as well as the nationally converted Jews (distinct, it is to be understood, from the risen saints of the present dispensation), being participators in this "regeneration" of all things. After which, and the *millennium* of its *duration* (perhaps here, comparing Isa. liv. 7, a *day* is meant for a *year*, as elsewhere in prophecy), may not the Apocalyptic post-millennial epoch coincide with St. Paul's: "Then cometh the end, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all"? (1 Cor. xv. 24.) Perfect, most certainly, according to the Apocalypse and the admittedly genuine Pauline and Petrine Epistles, was the union in Christian doctrine, love, and fellowship of the three Apostles, Paul, John, and Peter.

In conclusion, reverting to that which by its title, "L'ANTICHRIST," Renan sets forth before the world as the chief subject and object of his book, and to my own remark, at the commencement of my first letter, that never was there a time when a right understanding of the prophecies respecting ANTICHRIST was of more pressing importance than the present, let me end with a word of appeal on that subject to the Edinburgh Reviewer of Renan. At the opening of his Article he speaks contemptuously of my Apocalyptic exposition;—very differently, let me say, from an earlier Edinburgh Reviewer, the late Sir James Stephen. Probably he has never read it. However that may be, what I would ask is, whether, *coming out of the concealment of anonymous writing*, he would be willing, in the spirit of

(2) Rev. vii. 12, 14; Eph. i. 7, etc.

(3) Rev. vii.; Rom. xi. 18, 24; Rom. ix. 6; Eph. ii. 12—18; Eph. i. 13. And so, let me add, *St. Peter* also, including the converted Gentiles throughout Asia in the twelve tribes of the Israelitish dispersion. 1 Peter i. 1, iv. 3, etc.; compared with James i. 1.

(4) Rev. ii. 2, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14; Rom. ii. 28; Rev. xiii. and xvii.; 2 Thes. ii. 3, 12.

(5) Rev. iii. 11; xxii. 2; Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xii. 22, etc. (N.B.—The *Pauline* character, as well as early date of the Hebrews, is admitted by our authors.)

(6) Rev. xxii. 20, 21; 1 Thess. iv. 13—17; Phil. iv. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 3.

(7) Rev. xx. 4; xxi. 1, etc.; Rom. viii. 19, 23.; Thess. iv. 16, 18; Phil. i. 21, 23; Rom. xi. 26. Compare Matt. xix. 27.

Digitized by Google

a sincere lover of truth, really to examine into the evidence there offered, in proof (I believe convincing proof) of its successive symbolizations answering to Christ's announcement respecting them that thereby was to be foreshown in symbol "the things which were to happen afterwards;" that is from after the true *Domitianic* date of the Apocalypse, A.D. 95 or 96. Let me hope that this appeal will not be in vain. The evidence, as it goes on, will be found by him cumulative; and, as regards the Beast ANTICHRIST, to converge with irresistible force on the POPES OF ROME as the object intended:—their own starting-point of time in that character being marked by their solemn assumption of the blasphemous title of CHRIST'S VICAR, the exact equivalent of ANTICHRIST, at the end of the fifth century, and that of their becoming a *political power* the epoch of the ten Romano-Gothic kings of Western Christendom recognizing and bowing down to them in that character. This recognition, let me be permitted to add ere concluding, was completed about A.D. 607, the date of Phocas' decree, and that from that year to A.D. 1867, when the present Pope issued his summons for the Vatican Council to Roman Catholic prelates only, declaring that the kings had broken off their allegiance to him, the interval was precisely 1,260 years, the predicted period of his *imperial* dominancy. Remain to us the 75 additional years of the *time of the end*, Dan. xii. In which is notably included the eventful Apocalyptic period of the 6th vial, Apoc. vi. 12, 16. In the hope of his acceding to my request, I will take care that a copy of these letters shall reach the Reviewer.

Yours, dear Mr. Editor, faithfully,

E. B. ELLIOTT.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

An Examination into the Doctrine and Practice of Confession. By William Edward Jelf, B.D., Author of "Quousque," sometime Censor of Christ Church, Bampton Lecturer, etc. London: Longmans, 1875.—We most heartily welcome this fresh effort which Mr. Jelf has made to counteract the Romish innovations which the Ritualistic party and those who are misled by them are striving to put into the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. Himself a High-Churchman, and a scholar of unquestioned reputation, he cannot be put down with the vulgar abuse which is indiscriminately heaped upon all who venture to question the resuscitation of disused rites and practices, which the common-sense of Englishmen, enlightened by the teaching of the Word of God, has so long and so deliberately rejected. Opponents may differ from his conclusions, but they must meet them, if they can, by argument; it will not suffice to abuse the author of them.

Digitized by Google

In the outset of his treatise Mr. Jelf takes especial pains to place in a clear and distinct light what is the real question at issue. This is done in a very careful and admirable manner. He disentangles the question whether "remission of sins is to be sought and ministered in that particular way known by the name of Sacramental or Auricular Confession," from a number of irrevelant considerations wherewith the advocates of the system delight to confound it, and treats it on its own merits. Again, he carefully distinguishes between confidential communication "on matters of conversation, and comment between a pastor and members of his flock, and the private confession of sins to a priest, and receiving from him as a priest his formal absolution as an outward means of grace, in itself an ordained means of recovery from sin or of obtaining pardon, or a recognised and desirable preparation for the Holy Communion." The first point he holds to be perfectly true, the rest utterly false; and we think he has proved this assertion with most resistless logic and most full and perfect clearness of demonstration. Auricular confession, as now practised in the Church of England by some of its more unsound members, he holds to be little different from the practice of Rome: there may be some trifling distinction in details, but it is identical in error. After a careful review of the difference between confidence, which is often a natural instinct, and confession, and after showing the complete absence of any Scriptural warrant for auricular confession, Mr. Jelf proceeds to prove that this baneful practice had no existence in the primitive Church. If, however, as some would argue, that private confession is a matter of ecclesiastical arrangement which the Church may introduce into her system if found expedient, notwithstanding the silence of Scripture and the absence of primitive sanction, Mr. Jelf shows convincingly how untenable what he aptly terms the "see-saw" argument is, which at one moment would make auricular confession a matter of Divine obligation and a Divine ordinance for the remission of sin, and at the next would make it merely a canonical arrangement. A most lucid explanation of the teaching of the formularies of our Church follows, and the worthlessness of the catenas alleged in favour of the Ritualistic teaching on confession is fully exposed. The argument is wound up by a strong remonstrance on the apathy which tolerates the existence of this dangerous evil, which, as he most truly observes, "destroys the very nerves of a nation, sucks out its life blood, places the lives, the consciences, the interests of the people at the mercy of a father confessor, who may by the means of the confessional have exercised dominion over the soul and the conscience of a weak or a wicked King or Ministry, which places the fortunes, the strength, and the resources of the nation in the hands of the priest." We have not subjected Mr. Jelf's volume to anything like exhaustive criticism, or even detail of its contents, and for this very plain and sufficient reason, that we are most anxious that those who would wish to form a just appreciation of the horrible evil which is menacing England, and would bid fair to reduce it to the level of Spain or Italy, should study the book for themselves, and ascertain from it

Digitized by Google

that neither in Scripture, nor in primitive Church history, nor upon any rational interpretation of the formularies of our own Church, is there any warrant for this fond thing, the invention of comparatively modern priestcraft, and the most deadly engine in the armoury of Rome for the subjugation of the consciences and the intellect of men. It is an evil worse than the Inquisition: the one destroyed bodies, the other ruins souls. It is a miserable thing that in this, too, English clergymen should be the apes of Rome.

John the Baptist. By Henry Robert Reynolds, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.—This volume contains what is called "the Congregational Union Lectures for 1874." After perusing it we could not help wondering whether in the "Memorial Hall" there is a specimen volume preserved which all lecturers are expected to reproduce in exact bulk. Except upon some such supposition as this it is difficult to account for Dr. Reynolds' book, which out of the brief records in the Gospels has expanded almost into what he terms a "*cursus theologicus;*" and might, according to his mode of treatment, have been capable of indefinite extension. There is hardly any topic which might not by a similar process be developed into a vast treatise. Our objection is, we must confess, strong to the mode of handling a subject which at times introduces whole pages which might in masses be transferred with equal propriety to any other religious treatise on which the author might happen to be engaged. There are, moreover, lengthened disquisitions on priests and prophets and Nazarites and Essenes, and so on, which are all fully elaborated, and makes the book a repertorium of the most miscellaneous information. We must confess, too, to more serious objection. There is probably not the slightest reason to doubt the orthodoxy of Dr. Reynolds himself; but we very much dislike not only his mode of expressing himself, but also his free use, or rather abuse, of apocryphal books and Jewish writings. It may be a kind of accommodation to the learned cant of the day, but it is not the less offensive, but it jars upon our feelings to read about the "synoptic Christ" and the "Johannine Christ." We dislike the adduction of a number of legends from the Talmud and the Koran to supplement the silence of Scripture. We dislike to be told that the Sadducees, "though credited with a denial of the resurrection and of the immortality of the soul, were ready to occupy high judicial and sacerdotal offices." Were these imputations wrongly laid to their charge? Was the evangelist St. Matthew mistaken? We dislike the assertion that John's statement, "God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham," was a hard, unsympathetic way of uttering a new truth. We do not imagine that by these and similar expressions, which abound throughout the book, Dr. Reynolds means any harm; but most assuredly such a mode of handling the Word of God can only engender irreverence in those who listen to it, however foreign the thought may be to the teacher. It seems that these lectures were not orally delivered; and therefore none but those who choose to read them will be affected by them. In our judgment they are not calculated to foster spiritual life, or to exalt the Word of God in the estimation of the students

Digitized by Google

of Cheshunt College, or indeed any one else. There are abundant evidences of extensive reading, and not unfrequently traces of considerable descriptive power; we can also fully credit the author for excellent intentions; but we should be very sorry to see the multiplication of similar volumes within the pale of our own communion. In this image of John the Baptist there is too much commixture of silver and brass and iron and clay, with the fine gold of Scripture, to make it pleasant or profitable to contemplate. We are sorry to make these animadversions upon the labours of a learned man, but we think he has erred in judgment and expression, and it would not be honest to our readers to conceal our opinion.

Wood Notes and Church Bells. By the Rev. Richard Wilton. London: Bell and Dalby. 1875.—Every country parish is not situate in Arcadia, as many a sorely-vexed parson knows to his cost. The battle against vice and ignorance and misery has to be fought amid the fairest scenes, as stoutly as in the dreary black country, or in the populous quarters of our manufacturing towns. It would, therefore, be a sore mistake to suppose that the country pastor is without his peculiar trials and difficulties, which it often requires much grace to enable him to bear. Still in many respects the lot falls to him in pleasant places, if he has the imagination enabling him to appreciate the advantages of his surroundings,—if he has sympathy with nature, and can derive satisfaction from the tranquil enjoyment of some of the choicest gifts which God has spared to the children of men. In case these remarks happen to fall under the notice of some one wearying of his peaceful solitude, we would earnestly commend to him a thoughtful perusal of Mr. Wilton's very choice volume of poetic thoughts and fancies. He may, perhaps, be led to understand what manifold sources of pleasure are within the reach of spirits having large appreciation for what is beautiful in art and nature, and how holy meditation and genial fancy can extract delight from the very simplest sources. We heartily welcome Mr. Wilton's volume, not only for its own intrinsic merit, but for its usefulness. There is a healthy, cheerful love throughout, whether in expressing sympathy with what is lovely and beautiful, or in the midst of meek resignation to chastening trials. It is a good book to read, full of holy thoughts. Many incidents of Scripture are brought out in exquisite relief, and even from the most trivial occurrences of country life valuable lessons are brought out, very wholesome for the reader. One of the peculiar glories of the Church of England is, that she has nurtured in her bosom a school of poets of so tender and devout a spirit as that to which Mr. Wilton belongs, and in which he holds no mean rank. What is beautiful and lovely in our English homes and sanctuaries is enshrined in worthy strains, and exquisite addition is made to our literature. Mr. Wilton's volume has been so long before the public that we refrain from quoting from it; but if any of our readers are not familiar with its contents, we would most earnestly commend it to their attention. It may fairly be characterised as "*incense of sweet spices.*"

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

DURING the month which is now drawing to a close the interest and feelings of religious men have mostly been concentrated upon what are now recognised as the May Meetings. As the purport of these meetings is the promotion of the glory of God and the salvation of man, they may well claim precedence from us over matters of more secular concern. When viewed as a collective whole, they are the nearest embodiment which can probably be realized of what is, in utopian fancy, the function of a Church; if it were not for these Societies which hold their anniversaries in May, much of this work would be left undone. It is curious to contrast the solemn trifling of Convocation over obsolete ritual, and the proper adjustment of forms and ceremonies, with the wide and all-comprehending grasp of these modern institutions. The evangelization of a lost world, whether at home or abroad, the circulation of God's Word, the remedies needful for the amelioration of all social evils, the religious education of the young,—all pass under review, and tidings are proclaimed of laborious and often successful exertion. It is easy to scoff at them, and so it would be easy to scoff at a review at Aldershot; but in neither case are these mere empty parades, as those who are intimately acquainted with them know full well. It is most satisfactory to be able to record that the attendances were large, the reports encouraging, and that throughout there was the manifestation of strong Protestant and Evangelical feeling unmistakably conspicuous. The noble speech of the Bishop of Durham at the Church Missionary anniversary, which was as it were a prelude, gave the tone which has been well sustained throughout.

During the whole of this period the American Evangelists have been prosecuting their labours with marked success. Many of the most eminent men in Church and State have attended their services, and none but the extreme section of the irreligious press have sneered at what God has so visibly owned and blessed.

The proceedings in Parliament have not been of peculiar interest. Sir Stafford Northcote fought the battle of his Budget successfully, even against so mighty an antagonist as Mr. Gladstone; and notwithstanding the long-winded harangues and ceaseless opposition of the Irish members, the Peace Preservation Bill has, in all its substantial provisions, made its way through the House of Commons.

More interest and anxiety has been felt as to what would be the probable course of events on the Continent of Europe.

Digitized by Google

Warlike rumours have been prevalent, and there was a strong impression that Germany, jealous of the wonderful recuperative power exhibited by France, would take the initiative, and precipitate a fresh war. Since, however, the visit of the Emperor of Russia to the Emperor of Germany at Berlin, public feeling has been much reassured, and pacific counsels seem to be in the ascendant. Meanwhile there is no symptoms of any relaxation on the part of Prince Bismarck in the repressive policy which he is pursuing towards Ultramontanism. The Romish clergy in Prussia have been disendowed, and all religious orders, excepting those which devote themselves to the care of the sick, have been dissolved; convents and monasteries will be suppressed. The necessity for these sharp measures springs from the disloyalty engendered by Jesuit intrigue, of which we in England had such bitter experience subsequent to our Reformation.

The Guikwar of Baroda has been deposed, and will pay the penalty of his crimes by deposition from his power, and perpetual exile from the country which he has so frightfully misgoverned. The verdict of the Commission upon him is tantamount to that he is an "unconvicted poisoner."

The Synod of the Irish Church has concluded its sittings for the present. The result of their debates is that not only are the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed to be omitted when the Creed is read, but the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick is to be replaced by that in the Communion service. The eastward position is distinctly prohibited. Some other changes in various portions of the Services have been adopted, guarding more stringently against Romish error, such as the complete removal of the Apocrypha; and the question of sponsors, which our Convocation has been fumbling at for many years, has been settled. These alterations, however, must be further voted upon next year before they become the law of the Church. Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon, in consequence of these resolutions, are exerting themselves to organise a schism, if possible, in the Church of Ireland.

Professor Ewald is dead.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limited period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the reduced price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 7. JULY. [1875.

SANCTIFICATION.

THE subject of personal holiness is a vital one. The spiritual revival that has taken place recently, has brought it into especial prominence. We may deprecate the controversy that divides good men on details affecting it: but truth has nothing to fear, and has everything to gain, by free discussion. Only let such a sacred subject be handled reverently, humbly, Scripturally, and above all with continual prayer for the illumination of the blessed Spirit. Too many of us have not sufficiently realized the promise, "Sin shall not have dominion over you;" and that "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made (the believer) free from the law of sin and death:" *i.e.*, from "the law of sin which is in the members," and which the Apostle calls also "the body of this death." (Rom. vi. 14; vii. 23, 24; viii. 2; compare also 3, 4.) "What the law could not do, God, sending His own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." It has been truly said by an able thinker,[a] some time deceased, "What would it avail that a man should be accepted to justification, as long as the miserable object of pardon shrank cowering from the circle of angels, unable to sympathize in their fervours, or find in his heart one echo to their celestial anthems? No: what we are to be in heaven, we must be on earth. We are saved that we may for eternity serve God. Salvation itself would be misery, if unaccompanied by a love for that service." The fixed law of Him with whom we have to do is, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

Let us lay it down as a principle at the outset, that our first

[a] Professor W. Archer, "Butler's Sermons:" vii. p. 104.

Digitized by Google

grand need as sinners is a judicial title to heaven. In ourselves and our works, from the cradle to the grave, there can be no ground of our justification before God. That title comes to us wholly and solely from a righteousness wrought for us, not by us,—even the perfect righteousness of our Lord Jesus, which is unto and upon all them that believe. (Rom. iii. 22.) This is the meetness for which Paul thanks our loving God, in Col. i. 12: "Giving thanks unto the Father who once for all made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son." It is not here our progressive sanctification that is meant; for it is the Father's work, not the Holy Spirit's work, that is mentioned, giving thanks to the Father: and it is not a work now going on in believers, but what the Father did for them in the past. The Aorist (ἱκανώσαντι) marks the work as once for all finished. It is not, He *hath* made us meet,—but, He *made us* meet *once for all*, by delivering us from the powers of darkness and translating us into the kingdom of His dear Son.

Here then we have the foundation of progressive sanctification. Faith appropriates Christ's atoning work: judicial meetness for heaven issues in personal meetness for heaven. For the same Holy Spirit who enables us to trust in Christ crucified for justification, unites us to Christ, the risen and ascended Saviour, for our sanctification. The same mighty Spirit which raised Him from the dead, becomes in us a quickening power, raising us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. Hence Paul prays for himself (Phil. iii. 10), "That I may know the power of His resurrection;" and also for the Ephesians (i. 18, 19), "That ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward that believe, according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ Jesus when He raised Him from the dead."

Vital union with Christ sanctifies, for it assimilates us to Him; so that "as He is, so are we in this world." (1 John iv. 19.) As He died to sin once for all, "Likewise," saith Paul (Rom. vi. 10, 11), "reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." As Christ rose from the dead, so believers are risen with Christ; and as He sitteth on the right hand of God, so God hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. (Eph. ii. 6; Col. iii. 1—4.) Hence comes the precept flowing from the privilege. As ye are dead, and as your life is hid with Christ in God, and as Christ is now sitting above, "set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth."

So close is the vital union between Christ and His people,

Digitized by Google

through their faith, which is the Father's gift and the Holy Spirit's work, that Paul testifies, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." (Gal. ii. 20.) Henry Martyn wrote, "Christ is nearer to me than father, mother, or nearest relative: I do not know anything that would be heaven to me but the service of Christ and the enjoyment of His presence."

We have seen so far faith as the seed of sanctification; as it is written in Acts xv. 9, "God purifieth our hearts by faith." Inseparably connected with faith is its working principle, which is love. We all are ready to do anything for one we love. Now the love of Christ is the most powerful of all kinds of love: "The love of Christ constraineth us," is Paul's testimony as to its power. Self is the root of all sin: love to Christ constrains us no longer to live to self, but to Him that died for us and rose again. (2 Cor. v. 14.) Love constrained the woman, in Simon the Pharisee's house, to bathe the Saviour's feet with her tears and to wipe them with the hairs of her head. Being forgiven much, she could not but love much, and loving much she thought no sacrifice too great for His sake; and so she joyfully and humbly lavished on Him the costliest ointment, which filled the whole house with its fragrance. We love Him because He first loved us. This inseparable connection between love and holiness appears also in 1 Thess. iii. 12: "The Lord make you to abound in love; to the end that He may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His holy ones."

A third grace, close akin to faith and love, is hope. This too is a great incentive to sanctification. "Beloved," writes John (1 John iii. 2, 3.), "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." There is nothing more sanctifying than the waiting, believing, and loving hope of the glorious appearing again of our Lord Jesus. So that, we see all the three graces which the Holy Spirit gives to the believer,—faith, love and hope,—are the fruitful seed of growth in sanctification.

But here we have an important question to decide, and Scripture alone must decide it,—Is the believer ever perfectly freed from sin and the corruption of the flesh whilst still in the present body? First, it is clearly to holiness that God calls us He predestinated us, not merely to heavenly bliss, but "to be conformed to the image of His son." (Rom. viii. 29; Luke i. 75.) And again in Zechariah's song, the purpose of God's covenant

Digitized by Google

is declared to be "that we might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him all the days of our life." But it is with equal clearness laid down (1 John i. 8), "If we say, We have no sin, we deceive ourselves." The expression is not merely that we have had no sin, but that we have no sin now. John is speaking of believers who walk in the light; even they would be deceiving themselves, if they were to say, "We have no sin now." The devoted missionary, Henry Fox, said, "I long to be out of the power of sin: though it no longer reigns in me, it has a wonderful power of making me dishonour my Saviour. If I was always victorious I should not care for the length of the battle, but I grow weary of struggling, and being buffeted, and often taken prisoner."

Still the same Apostle, John, writes (1 John iii. 9), "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." How are we to reconcile the seemingly opposed statements? The key is in our Lord's words (John viii. 34), "Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin." Committing sin means the practice of sin. The law of sin and death reigns in the unconverted: the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made the believer free from the law of sin and death. The flesh, or old nature, which is the law of sin and death, exists still in the believer, and to his last moment of life merits God's wrath and condemnation: but the flesh no longer reigns. He sins indeed, but he does not commit sin: sin no longer reigns. He is a free man: "If the Son make you free, then are you free indeed." The new nature is his true self, and the new nature never sins. So John adds, "For his seed remaineth in him,"—the seed of his new-born nature; and he cannot sin continuously (for so the present infinitive in the Greek implies) because he is born of God. The bias of his new nature is towards the opposite way from sin. The habit of sin is broken in them by the believing view of the love of God in Christ. The life of the believer is no longer animated by the sinful flesh, but by the seed from heaven, out of which nothing unholy can proceed. "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

Though the believer's divine life, his truest self, is victorious over sin, yet as the fleshly nature remains, there is need of perpetual warfare. "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." "Fight the good fight of faith." "Take unto you the whole armour of God." "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure." (1 Peter i. 19.) Not passive quietism, but active personal struggling is the life of faith. Christ must do all: we also must do all. "I can do all things," saith Paul, but it is only "through Christ which strengtheneth me." (Phil. iv. 3.)

Digitized by Google

Paul regarded himself in one sense as perfect, in another sense as not perfect. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect (*i.e.* perfect in aim), be thus minded."

There are three stages in the perfecting of the saints. The first is their being made perfect as to conscience. Ceremonial services "could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience" (Heb. ix. 9); but "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (14); so "let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." (x. 22.) The first attainment of perfection as to the conscience is when as sinners we behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. The fears and misgivings and accusations of conscience give place instantly to a peaceful sense that we are complete in Christ. The continued maintenance of perfect peace of conscience depends on our not letting any sin, which the flesh betrays us into, remain as a gloomy weight on the conscience, but immediately going afresh to the fountain of Jesus' blood to wash it clean away.

In this sense Jesus is made unto us sanctification as well as justification. By the will of God we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all. God regards believers as completely sanctified already by virtue of our union with Christ. The love of the Father from everlasting sanctifies, in the sense of consecrating them in His electing purpose as objects of His mercy. Believers are, according to 1 Peter i. 2, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Christ." In this sense "sanctified" is put before "justified" in 1 Cor vi. 11. "Ye are sanctified (*i.e.* consecrated in God's purpose), ye are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God." Grounded upon this perfect sanctification or consecration of the believer in God's purpose once for all, is our progress in sanctification. "By one offering Christ hath perfected for ever (as to the conscience and as to our title to holiness and heaven) them that are being sanctified," so the Greek expresses it. The sanctification is being carried on progressively and surely. In God's purpose we are regarded as completely sanctified in Christ from the first. This sanctification is developed by degrees in those who have been once for all justified by believing. As faith brings the conscience into its first perfect rest in Jesus, so faith continuing in the same Saviour preserves us through the Holy Ghost in the same perfect rest.

Digitized by Google

Peter (2 i. 9) traces the lack of Christian graces in some to their having forgotten they were purged from their old sins. The consciousness of being forgiven kindles within us a perpetual flame of love to the Saviour; and this flame more and more consumes the fleshly dross, and presents the believer as a whole burnt-offering unto God. Prayer, watchfulness, meditation, the Word of God and yielding up of our will to God's will, are the means. God and the Spirit of Christ must do all in and by us: yield up yourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God; so sin shall not have dominion over you.

As the conscience receives its perfecting the moment we believe in the perfect Saviour, so the soul receives its perfecting at death. This reconciles the believer to the unrepealed sentence of death to the body which he, like all others, must undergo. His own death shall deliver him from the presence of sin, as Christ's death has already delivered him from the guilt and power of sin. He shall at death thenceforth be under the blessed necessity of sinning no more. What a cheering prospect! We shall soon in soul join the spirits of just men made perfect.

Finally, the third and crowning perfection shall be, Christ the Lord at His coming again shall perfect our bodies too. "He shall transfigure our body of humiliation (ταπεινώσεως), that it may be fashioned like unto His body of glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things to Himself." (Phil. iii. 21.) "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all pollutions of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." (2 Cor. vii. 1.)

GOVINDA SAMANTA.

Govinda Sámanta, or The History of a Bengal Ráiyat. By the Rev. Lál Behári Day. London: Macmillan. 1875.

FEW who have been resident in India have failed to be conscious of the very slight acqaintance they were able to form with the inner life and habits of thought of those by whom they were surrounded, and whose happiness and welfare they were desirous to promote. Any person who should form his opinion of the English character from our police offices and courts of law must receive very unfavourable and erroneous impressions; but it is to these that in India the experiences of the Englishman are principally confined; nor are those opportunities much enhanced by occasional visits of ceremony or official intercourse

Digitized by Google

with the higher classes. The Englishman is seldom approached, except by those who have some personal motive, and he has no power of approaching the people amid the ordinary routine of their daily life. The consequence is that the least favourable side of the native character is generally presented to the European, and it requires some effort of the judgment, and no little charity, amid the surroundings of perjury and chicanery of the courts of law, to remember how many millions of engagements are honestly acknowledged and faithfully fulfilled; and when occupied from morning to night in unravelling the intricacies of family disputes and witnessing the bitterness of family hatreds, it is difficult to remember how many millions of families are living in harmony and affection under the patriarchal institutions of the Hindoos. The consequence is that most thoughtful Englishmen who have passed the better part of a life in India, and a life devoted to the amelioration of the people, feel that they leave the country with a very imperfect knowledge of those whom they have desired to benefit.

A feeling of this fact, and a desire to make his fellow-countrymen better known to their rulers, prompted a native gentleman of Calcutta to offer a prize for the best tale illustrative of the social life of the peasantry of Bengal, and hence the origin of a very clever and a very interesting work. The author having been born in Hindooism was well qualified to describe its inner life, and picture the early impressions of its teachings on the mind, and to show the way in which its ceremonies pervade the every-day life of a Hindoo family, and entwine themselves around all the tender memories of home and childhood of an affectionate people; while an English education, and a thorough knowledge of our language, has enabled him to dress his narrative in a form acceptable to the English reader. The Rev. Lál Behári Day was an elève in the school of the Free Church of Scotland, at Calcutta, and his conversion to Christianity was one of the fruits of the labours of the eminent missionary of that Church, Dr. Duff, to whom the cause of education in India is so largely indebted. The literary powers of the writer have been long known in the metropolis of India, and his power as a preacher renders him acceptable to a large congregation in connection with the Scottish Free Church, of which he is the pastor.

The plan of the book, if plan it can be said to have, is that of a simple narrative of the daily life, the hopes and fears, the enjoyments and the sufferings, of the various members of a peasant's family in the plains of Bengal. The reader is presented with a series of pictures, accurate as photographs, of the country and its people, each admirably executed, and evincing much skill in the artist. The language is easy and idiomatic, and affords a striking proof of the knowledge

Digitized by Google

which the people of India are obtaining of our literature, and of their power of appreciating it; but the value of the work consists chiefly in the patient fidelity of its pictures. The absence of any sustained plot may, we fear, render the book uninteresting to the general reader, and it is a striking illustration of a phase through which the Hindoo mind is passing: it leaves the impression on the English reader of a clever copy. The author's reading has evidently had a wide range. He has certainly mastered our early and best novelists, and has appreciated their merits; and it is not to his discredit if the effect is visible in his pages. But we doubt whether the want of originality and the crudeness of the plot may not limit the enjoyment of the book to the narrow circle of Anglo-Indians. To them, and to all desirous of knowing the people of India, we can strongly recommend it.

We shall select as many passages as our space permits; but to render them intelligible a short reference to the previous history of the Bengal provinces under British rule is indispensable.

Those who have even a slight knowledge of Indian history are aware that in the districts of Bengal what is called the Zemindary system prevails. The early English Government, finding itself in the position of an universal landlord, but feeling the difficulty of discharging the duties the position involved, endeavoured to divest itself of this responsibility by seeking out, or creating, a body of landlords to stand between themselves and the people. We cannot pause to say how, in many instances, the person in whom the Government thought they recognised a landed proprietor, and whom they invested with all the rights of one, proved to be in fact only the farmer of the revenue, or publican, under the late Government, and as welcome to the people as their landlord as the same class of people would have been to the Jews. Some were certainly hereditary Zemindars. To carry out this undoubtedly well-intentioned measure an enormous sacrifice of revenue was made. The Government restricted the claim of the State in perpetuity to the fixed amount of land-tax then paid, and as all the uncultivated land was thrown into the estates, this act compromised all the future resources of the State. If the revenue thus sacrificed is computed, as it may fairly be, by comparing the land assessment now realized in Madras and other parts of India with that which the State receives on a corresponding area in Bengal, the loss will be found to amount to several millions a year.

The benevolent object which this enormous sacrifice was intended to secure has been but too partially realized. The hopes of the Government, that it was creating a class of landed gentry

Digitized by Google

interested in the improvement of their estates and the welfare of their people, have been too sadly disappointed. Instead of a class of resident proprietors, the land is held mainly by absentee owners, by whom it has been sub-let to a class of men who can only properly be called contractors for the rent, and by them has been sub-let, till frequently as many as four persons intervene between the cultivator and the Zemindar.

While the effect of the system on the revenues of the State have been as unfavourable as we have described, the loss sustained by the Treasury has not been compensated by any benefit to the agriculture of the country. The land of Bengal is even more minutely subdivided than that of other parts of India, and the cultivation is carried on, after the ancient fashion, by a patient and industrious peasantry; the landlord's part being limited to exacting the largest possible amount of rent, and as many irregular cesses as the custom of the country and the endurance of the people will permit. An enormous expansion of cultivation and increase of population are undoubtedly perceptible, but are due to the unbroken peace secured by a strong government, and to the habits of the people, especially in regard to marriage, rather than to any action on the part of the landowners.

But the influence of a proprietary body such as we have described, to whom the rent of the land is paid, must always be great for good or for evil,—and unfortunately it has too often been for evil. A class of men unfit to be associated in the magistracy of the country, but exercising the influence which landlordism always gives, become naturally antagonistic to the functionaries of the Government; and the police of the central power is thwarted by the endeavours of the Zemindars to prevent the peasantry seeking its interference. Crime is carefully hushed up, and the silence or connivance of the subordinates of Government is secured by corruption or intimidation. But when the operation of the constituted authorities of Government is paralysed some irregular power must take its place. The disputes and feuds of rival neighbours must be settled, and the demands of the landlord or his tenantry must be enforced, if not legally, then illegally. Consequently, the bands of lattials, or club men—a class of paid bullies, in the hire of the Zemindars —their faction fights, and their village tyranny, figure largely in the pages of Bengal official history.

Another serious result of a well-meant but mistaken policy has been the diminished power of the Central Government to promote the improvement of the country. A scrupulous interpretation of the original contract with the landlords, restricting the demands of the State to a fixed sum, long led the rulers to

Digitized by Google

doubt whether a rate levied even for local purposes would not be a violation of their pledged faith. To expend money from the general treasury on the construction of roads and bridges in Bengal was obviously unjust, as it would be to apply the money of the heavily-assessed people of other provinces to swell the gains of the Bengal proprietors. The selfishness of the great body of the Zemindars refused all invitations to self-taxation for public purposes, and the roads remained unmade till the difficulty should be solved. The peculiar advantages which Bengal possesses in its water communication has prevented the evil being felt in this direction, as it must have been in other countries; but the example illustrates the impeded action of the Government in many other respects.

It will thus be seen that the characters likely to figure in a tale of village life in Bengal will be—the humble, patient hard-working proprietor of a small farm, with his family and friends; the absentee Zemindar; the hard-hearted exacting sub-infeudator; his merciless agents; a corrupt police official; and the lattial, or bully. The accessories will be the village schoolmaster, the village barber, the village astrologer, the village doctor, with others; and in the present day the Christian missionary, either resident or itinerant.

To these an extraneous but important figure has to be added in a picture of modern Bengal life,—the English Indigo-planter. The indigo factory is now an important feature in a Bengal landscape, and its owner, or more often its manager, is an influential agent in Bengal rural life. Unhappy circumstances have rendered this subject only too well suited to dramatic purposes.

The incidents of such a tale will be the common events of rural life,—its joys and sorrows. Its joys,—the birth-day rejoicing, the marriage festivity, the village festival, the harvest home. Its sorrows,—the family separation, the exactions of the landlord, the oppression of the public functionary, the violence of the indigo factor.

And such are the characters and such the incidents of the tale before us: the characters admirably drawn, the incidents inartistically strung together. Each separate picture is excellent; the whole effect is injured by unskilful management.

The hero of the tale is the son of a Bengal peasant, whom the author conducts, not as we should say, from the cradle to the grave, but from his mother's hip to the funeral pile, through the ordinary incidents of peasant life in the first instance, but culminating in a violent death through the exceptional causes which we have summarised above. The scene is laid in the district of Burdwan, known to many of our readers as the field of labour of the excellent missionary Weitbrecht. The father of

Digitized by Google

Govinda Sámanta is one of three brothers cultivating an ancestral holding of twelves acres of land. The family consists of the three brothers, their much-respected and admirable mother, the wives of two of the brothers, and a charming little daughter of the eldest brother, the bright little Málati; when a son, our hero, is ushered into the world to gladden the hearts and to share the slender resources of the family. The following scene gives an admirable picture of Indian rural life, and announces the birth of the hero. We have said advisedly of Indian rural life, for with a slight change of names it would apply to other provinces as well as to Bengal.

"It was midday. The cruel sun, like a huge furnace, was sending forth hot flames all around. There was hardly any breeze, the broad leaves of the tall palmyra hung quite motionless; the cows were resting in the shade of trees, and were chewing the cud; and the birds were enjoying their mid-day siesta. At such a time, when all Nature seemed to be in a state of collapse, a solitary husbandman was seen ploughing a field on the eastern side of the village of Kánchanpur. In the previous evening there had been a shower, accompanied with a thunderstorm, and Mánik Sámanta was taking advantage of that circumstance, to prepare the soil for the early crop of *Aus dhán*, so-called from the fact of that sort of paddy ripening in less time than is taken by the *Aman*, or the winter paddy. . . . . .

"Look at him. Floods of perspiration are pouring in copious streams down his swarthy cheeks as he holds the plough by both his hands and scolds the bullocks at the top of his voice. The bullocks do not apparently like the idea of working. Every now and then they stand stock-still. Mánik catches the tails of the oxen, twists them with all his might, and abuses the poor animals as if they were pickpockets. 'You sálá' (wife's brother), 'why don't you move? Don't you see it is getting late? Do you want a bambooing on your forehead, you brother-in-law of a brute?' Seeing that threats prove unavailing, he has recourse to flattery, and addresses the team thus—'Get on, my treasure, my father, my child; get on a little further, and the whole will be over.' But in vain. The jaded, thirsty, hungry brutes, who had been tugging at the plough since early dawn, refuse to stir. Not far from this scene of alternate scolding and coaxing, were observed two men under the shade of an *asvatha* tree situated near a pool of water. One of them was lying down on the grass, and the other who seemed to be the older of the two, had his hookah in his hand. . . . . .

"When the older of the two men, sitting and smoking under the tree, saw in what a plight Mánik and his bullocks were, he bawled out, 'Ho, Manik! you had better loosen the oxen, they are tired; and you yourself come and rest here.' The moment the bullocks were loosened from the plough, they rushed towards the pool, and putting their fore feet into the water, took a long draught. Mánik himself, with the plough on his shoulders came to the tree, and

Digitized by Google

began smoking with his companions. The eldest of the party said to the other two, 'Brothers, let us all bathe and get ready for *bhát* (boiled rice), as Málati must soon be here.' Mánik replied, 'Very well. Gayárám,' addressing the youngest of the three, 'you had better rub your body with oil.' Gayárám replied, 'Let brother Badan begin.' . . . . . .

"I need scarcely tell the reader that these three persons were brothers. The eldest, Badan, who was about thirty years old, was the head of the family. Mánik, the second brother, was about twenty-five years of age, and the third, Gayárám, about twenty. Gayárám had charge of the cows which were grazing, and the two elder brothers had come to work with the plough. They had no other clothing than a simple *dhuti*, about four yards long and a yard broad, wrapped round their waists, and descending a little below the knees. The rest of the body was quite bare; they had nothing on their heads, and as for shoes, they had never used any since the day of their birth. The poet Hesiod advises the Boeotian peasant to sow naked, to plough naked, and to reap naked, but this exhortation of the Theban bard hardly applies to the Bengal ráiyat, as he is always in a state of semi-nudity. Each of the three brothers, however, had a spare piece of cloth called *gámchhá*, or bathing towel, about three cubits long and a cubit and a half broad. The *gámchhá*, is indispensable to every Hindu peasant of Bengal, as he bathes every day in the year. But besides its use in bathing, it serves a variety of purposes. It acts as a wrapper for the head, to protect it from the sun; sometimes it serves the purpose of a *chádar*, or sheet, when it is placed on the shoulder; sometimes it does duty for a belt round the waist, and it is always handy for tying up anything in it, as the Bengal peasant has no pockets. . .

"Badan was of the average height of a Bengali; strong built, had a rather high forehead, and large, bright eyes, and his body, especially his chest, was thickly covered with hair. Gayárám resembled Badan in features, though they had not become so hard through toil. . . . . .

"Mánik was quite different from the other two; and no one that did not know him could ever suppose from his look that he was the brother of Badan and Gayárám. His complexion was much darker than that of the other two, it was deep ebony, or rather, glossy Day and Martin; indeed, he had the darkest complexion of anyone in the village, and it was in consequence of this circumstance, that, although his name was Mánik, or the jewel, he was universally called Kálamánik, or the Black Jewel. He was taller than the average run of his countrymen, being upwards of six feet high; he had a large head of hair which was not parted, which never had come in contact with a comb, and which stood erect like the bristles of a porcupine; his mouth was wider than that of most men, and, when open, discovered two rows of ivory-white teeth, so big in size that his friends compared them to the hoe with which he was so familiar as an implement of husbandry. His arms were of such length that when he stood bolt upright the tips of his fingers reached his knee-joints. On each shoulder there was a hump, not unlike

Digitized by Google

that of a Bráhmini bull, an aggregation of flesh generally owned by *Pálki* bearers and other persons accustomed to carry heavy loads on their shoulders. His feet were not straight, but took the shape of an arc of a circle. The toes, which closely stuck to one another, were all bent towards the big toe; and he could never move two paces, but some of his toes cracked and gave out a peculiar kind of music. It may be easily conceived that a gigantic figure, upwards of six feet in height, of ebony complexion, wide-mouthed, hoe-toothed, high-shouldered, long-armed, and splay-footed, was not 'a thing of beauty,' and therefore not 'a joy for ever.' He was an object of terror to all the children of the village, who, when fractious, used invariably to be quiet when they were told that Kálamánik was coming. Nor had the maidens of the village better regard for him. Badan was anxious that Kálamánik should enjoy connubial felicity: but though he easily succeeded in getting a wife for his youngest brother Gayárám, no parents in wide Kánchanpur, or in any village twenty miles around, could be persuaded to bestow the hand of their daughter on the Black Jewel. Kálamánik was more simple than most of his class—indeed, it was generally asserted that he was somewhat silly; but this mental defect was amply compensated by his great physical strength and courage. He was the swiftest runner, the fastest swimmer, and the best wrestler in the village; he could stop a huge Brahmini bull, when running in fury, by catching hold of its horns; he could carry on his head a whole stack of paddy sheaves; and in every village fray he always stood in the fore-front, and manipulated his club with the strength of Hercules and the unerring precision of Yama himself. Such was the Black Jewel of the Golden City, the uncle of our hero.

"After the lapse of an hour or two, a little girl was seen approaching the tree under which Gayárám was sitting, with a small bundle in her hand. On seeing her, Badan and Kálamánik loosened the bullocks, and joined the party under the tree.

"Badan said, 'Well, Málati, so you have brought *bhát*. All right at home?'

"The little girl replied, 'Yes, *Bábá* (Papa); a *khoká* (male child) has come into the house."

"The three simultaneously exclaimed,

"'A *khoká!* good! When was it born?'

"'At noon,' was the reply.

"After replying to a few more inquiries, Málati opened her bundle and brought out the dinner, which consisted of a large quantity of boiled rice, and some vegetables cooked with fish. The dinner service consisted of three pieces of plantain-leaf and a brass *ghati* (a small drinking vessel). The little girl dealt out the dinner, and her father (for she was Badan's daughter) and uncles did full justice to it. It is superfluous to say that they ate with their fingers; they drank from the same *ghati*, which was replenished every now and then from the pool, though in the act of drinking their lips did not touch the vessel. After they had gargled their mouths and washed their hands, they again began to smoke. They then resolved, on account of the joyful news they had heard, to

Digitized by Google

discontinue the labours of the day, and go home; Gayárám, however, stayed behind, as the cows could not well be brought home before sunset."

To give our readers a full idea of the author's power of description we present them with his pictures of *the village, the hut,* and *the family* of an Indian peasant.

"THE VILLAGE."

"Kánchanpur, or the Golden City, is a considerable village in Parganá Sáhábad, in the district of Vardhamána, and lies about six miles to the north-east of the town of that name. It has a population of about fifteen hundred souls, belonging to most of the thirty-six castes into which the Hindus of Bengal are generally divided, though the predominating caste in the village was the *sadgopa*, or the agricultural class. Why the village has obtained the name of the 'golden city,' I have not been able exactly to ascertain; some of the oldest inhabitants maintain that it has been so called on account of the wealth accumulated, and comforts enjoyed by the peasantry in general; while others are of opinion that the village has been called 'golden,' on account of the residence in it of some rich families of the *suvarnavanikas* (literally, traders in gold), usually called the banker caste. However this may be, Kánchanpur is a large and prosperous village. There is a considerable Bráhmana population, the great majority of whom are of the *srotriya* order, often called *rádhi*, from the fact of their living in *Rádh*, the name by which the country lying on the western side of the Bhágurathi river is usually designated. The *káyasthas*, or the writer caste, are comparatively few in number. *Ugra-kshatriyas*, or *Aguris*, as they are called in common parlance, who are all engaged in agricultural pursuits, though less numerous than the *sadgopas*, are an influential class in the village; while there is the usual complement of the medical caste, of blacksmiths, barbers, weavers, spice-sellers, oilmen, *bágdis*, *doms hádis*, and the rest. Strange to say, there is hardly a single Muhammadan family in the village—the votaries of that faith being less numerous in western than in eastern Bengal. . . . . .

Kánchanpur, like most villages in Bengal, has four divisions agreeably to the four cardinal points of the compass,—the northern, the southern, the eastern, and the western. The village lies north and south, and the northern and southern divisions are much larger than the eastern and western. A large street runs north and south, straight as the crow flies, on which abut smaller streets and lanes from the eastern and western divisions. The bulk of the houses are mud cottages thatched with the straw of paddy, though there is a considerable number of brick houses, owned, for the most part, by the *káyasthas* and the banker caste. The principal street, of which I have spoken, is lined on both sides by ranges of houses, either of brick or of mud, each having a compound, with at least a tree or two, such as the plum, mango, guava, lime, or papaya, and

Digitized by Google

the invariable plantain. Outside the village, the main street is extended nearly a quarter of a mile at each end, with rows on either side of the magnificent *asvatha*, the *Ficus religiosa* of botanists. In the centre of the village are two temples of Siva, facing each other; one of them has a large colonnade, or rather polystyle, as there are no less than four rows of columns; and the intervening space between the two temples is planted with the *asvatha*. There are other temples of Siva in other parts of the village, but there is nothing about them worthy of remark. In the central part of each of the four divisions of the village there is a *vakula* tree *(Mimusops Elengi)*, the foot of which is built round with solid masonry, raised three or four feet above the ground, in the form of a circle, in the centre of which stands the graceful trunk. As the diameter of this circle is seldom less than twelve feet, a good number of people can easily sit on it, and you meet there, of an afternoon, the gentry of the village, squatting on mats or carpets, engaged in discussing village politics, or in playing at cards, dice, or the royal game of chess. . . . . .

"There are not more than half-a-dozen shops in the village; in these are sold rice, salt, mustard, oil, tobacco, and other necessaries of Bengali life. The villagers, however, are supplied with vegetables, clothes, cutlery, spices, and a thousand knick-knacks, twice a-week, from a *hát*, or fair, which is held on Tuesdays and Saturdays, on a plain on the south-western side. . .

"To a person coming towards the village, from whatever point of the compass, Kánchanpur presents a most striking view. In addition to the usual topes of mangoes and clumps of bamboo which skirt most villages in the country, our village is nearly encircled with some of the finest and most picturesque tanks in a district which is noted for its fine and picturesque tanks. These tanks, often covering forty or fifty acres of land, are surrounded by lofty embankments. On these embankments wave hundreds of the stately *tála (Borassus flabelliformis)*, which look from a distance like so many gigantic warders posted as sentinels on the high battlements of some fortified castle. Two of these tanks are worthy of description. On the south-east skirt of the village lies the *himságara*, or sea of ice, so called from the excessive coldness of its water. It has, like most tanks, two bathing *ghâts*, one for men and the other for women, at a good distance from each other. The steps of the landing-place are made of marble. At the head of the *ghát*, on either side, is a sacred *tulasi* plant *(Ocymum sanctum)*, placed on a high pedestal of masonry; a little higher up stand on two sides two *sriphal* trees *(Ægle Marmelos)*, and in front of the *ghát* is a temple containing a statue of Chaitanya, of the size of life. The other tank is called *Krishnaságara*, or the black sea, from the fact of its water appearing black from a distance; indeed, the people say that its water is as black as the eye of a crow. The *ghâts* of this great reservoir are not so grand as those of the *himságara*, but it is said to be the deepest tank in the village; indeed, some people believe that it has subterranean communication with *pátála*, or the infernal regions. It is also believed that in the bottom of the tank there are

Digitized by Google

jars of untold treasures, in the shape of gold *mohurs*, in custody of a demon of the *Yaksha* species. The *krishnasagara* is therefore looked upon with mysterious awe. The oldest inhabitant does not remember its having been drained of its fish, the drag-net having been invariably cut on such occasions in the middle of the tank. Scarcely any one bathes in it, though scores of women may be seen every morning and evening drawing water from it for drinking. As the tank has never been cleansed since it was excavated, it is filled with aquatic plants of a hundred species; yet its water is beautifully transparent, and unquestionably wholesome. The other tanks of the village, though not so large, contain equally good water, and their embankments are all covered, more or less thickly, with the heaven-pointing *tála*, with its long trunk and its leafy crown; while below the embankments, on all sides, are groves of the mango, the tamarind, and the *Kathbel (Feronia elephantum)*. . . . .

"Sir Henry Maine, in his ingenious and thoughtful work entitled 'Village Communities in the East and West,' adopting the language of the Teutonic township, speaks of three parts of an Indian village:—*first* the village itself, or the cluster of homesteads inhabited by the members of the community; *secondly*, the 'arable mark,' or lands under cultivation surrounding the village; and *thirdly*, the 'common mark,' or waste lands for pasturage. Of the first we have already spoken. The second, or the arable mark, of Kánchanpur consists of some thousands of *bighás* of land, encompassing the village, and forming a circle of cultivation the radius of which is about half-a-mile. Paddy of various kinds is the staple produce of the bulk of the land, though there are not wanting different species of pulse, rye, barley, cotton, tobacco, hemp, flax, and sugar-cane. As almost every inch of the land around the village was under cultivation, there was no 'common mark' or waste connected with it. Nor were waste lands needed for pasturage, as there was not a single flock of sheep in the village; and the cows and bullocks, of which there was a large number, grazed on the verdant spots on the roadside, on the sloping sides of tanks with high embankments, on the green balks separating one field from another, on the grass-covered areas of mango topes and tamarind groves, and on those patches of untilled land situated near pools of water which ever and anon relieve the eye amid the infinite expanse of never-ending paddy."

"THE HUT."

"You enter Badan's house with your face to the east, through a small door of mango wood on the street, and you go at once to the *uthan*, or open yard, which is indispensable to the house of every peasant in the country. On the west side of the yard, on the same line with the gate of which I have spoken, stands the *bara ghar*, or the big hut. This is the biggest, the neatest, and the most elaborately finished of all Badan's huts. Its walls, which are of mud, are of great thickness; the thatch, which is of the straw of paddy, is more than a cubit deep; the bamboo frame-work, on which the thatch is laid, is well compacted together—every interstice being

Digitized by Google

filled with the long and slender reed called *sará (Saccharum sara)* alternating with another reed of red colour; the middle beam, which supports the thatch, though it is neither of the costly teak nor *sál*, is made of the pith of the palmyra; and the floor is raised at least five feet from the ground. The hut is about sixteen cubits long and twelve cubits broad, including the verandah, which faces the yard, and which is supported by props of palmyra. It is divided into two compartments of unequal size, the bigger one being Badan's sleeping room, and the smaller one being the store-room of the family, containing a number of *hándis*, or earthen vessels, filled with provisions. The verandah is the parlour or the drawing-room of the family. There friends and acquaintances sit on mats. In Badan's sleeping-room are kept the brass vessels of the house and other valuables. There is no *khát* or bedstead in it, for Badan sleeps on the mud floor, a mat and a quilt stuffed with cotton interposing between his body and mother earth. There is not much light in the room, for the thatch of the verandah prevents its admission, while there is but one small window high up on the wall towards the street. I need scarcely add that there is no furniture in the room—no table, no chairs, no stools, no almirah, no wardrobe, no benches; there is only in one corner a solitary wooden box. In one side of the room two whole bamboos are stuck into the walls on which clothes are hung, and on which the bedding is put up in the day. Such is the *bara ghar*, or the big hut.

"On the south side of the yard, and at right angles to the big hut, is a smaller hut of far inferior construction, which serves a variety of purposes, and which is used by the women of the family when in an interesting condition. When not required for that purpose it is used as a lumber-room, or rather as a tool-room, for keeping the implements of husbandry. On the present occasion by Badan's wife and Rupá's mother. In the verandah of this little hut is placed the *dhenki*, or the rice-husking pedal. From this circumstance the little hut is called *dhenkisálá* (pedal-house), or more familiarly *dhenskál*.

"In the south-east corner of the yard, and at right angles to the *dhenkisálá*, is another hut of somewhat better construction, inside which Gayárám sleeps, and the verandah of which serves the purpose of a kitchen. From this latter circumstance it is called *páksálá* (cooking-house), but Badan and his family always called it by the more familiar name of *ránnághar*. The only other hut on the premises is the cow-house, called *gosálá*, or more familiarly *goál*. It is situated to the north of the yard, nearly parallel to the big hut, only the cow-house is much longer than all the other huts. Several large earthen tubs, called *nánds*, which serve the purposes of troughs, are put on the floor, half buried in small mounds of earth, near which are stuck in the grouud tether-posts of bamboo. In one corner is a sort of fire-place, where every night a fire, or rather smoke, of cow-dung cakes is made, chiefly for the purpose of saving the bovine inmates from the bite of mosquitoes and fleas.

"About the middle of the *uthán*, or yard, and near the cow-house, is the granary of paddy, called *golá* in other parts of the country,

Digitized by Google

but in the Vardhamána district invariably called *marái*. It is cylindrical in shape, made entirely of ropes of twisted straw, with a circular thatch on the top. It contains a quantity of paddy sufficient for the consumption of the family from one harvest to another. Not far from the granary is the *pálui*, or straw stack, which is an immense pile of paddy-straw kept in the open air, to serve as fodder for cows and oxen for a whole year. Behind the kitchen, and near the tank, is the *sárkuda*, or the dust-heap of the family, which is a large hole, not very deep, into which the sweepings of the yard, the ashes of the kitchen, the refuse of the cow-house, and all sorts of vegetable matter, are thrown. This dust-heap, though somewhat hurtful in a sanitary point of view, is essentially necessary to our ráiyat, as it supplies him with manure for his fields.

"THE FAMILY."

"The other members of the family were Badan's mother, Alanga; his wife, Sundari; his daughter, Málati; and Gayárám's wife, Aduri. Alanga, forty-six years old, was the *grihini* or mistress of the household. Her son Badan paid her boundless respect, and always agreed to every domestic arrangement she made. Nor were her other sons and her daughters-in-law less obedient to her. Badan's wife, Sundari, might be expected, according to English notions, as the wife of the head of the family, to feel aggrieved at her being deprived of her rightful authority as the mistress of the house. But such a notion is never entertained by a Bengali wife while her mother-in-law is living. And the idea never occurred to Sundari. She deemed it her duty, and esteemed it a privilege, to be under the guardianship of her husband's mother. She was thankful that all domestic affairs were under the management of one so much older, wiser, and more experienced than she. As the eldest daughter-in-law in the house, Sundari was the cook of the family, in which work she was assisted by Gayárám's wife, Aduri. Now that Sundari was confined, the work of the kitchen devolved chiefly on Badan's mother, Alanga, as Aduri was too young to be wholly trusted with that important department.

"Unlike Sundari, Aduri was somewhat peevish and often showed temper, especially when, as on the present occasion, she had a great deal to do. She was naturally of an imperious disposition, and therefore hated the idea of playing second—or rather third—fiddle in the family. Amidst the general harmony which prevailed in Badan's house, she was the only cause of discord. With Badan and Kálamánik she, of course, never exchanged a single word in her life; for it is reckoned a piece of the greatest indecency on the part of a woman even to look at the face of her husband's elder brothers, though with his younger brothers she is permitted to be quite familiar. Aduri had therefore not only not spoken to Badan and Kálamánik, but they had never seen her face, she being always completely veiled when going about in the house in their presence. She often gave cross answers to her mother-in-law, for which she got curtain-lectures from her husband at night—indeed, now and then something more substantial than lectures, namely, a slap or a

Digitized by Google

cuff, in consequence of which the whole of the following day she gave sullen looks and peevish answers.

"Málati, Badan's daughter, was a girl of about seven years of age. Though her complexion was by no means fair, her features were far from disagreeable. She had the gentleness of her mother's disposition, and though as the first, and for a long time the only child in the house, she was made too much of, her head never got turned. She never did a rude thing, nor uttered a cross word. She was the joy of Badan's life. After the fatiguing labours of the day in the field, he would of an evening sit cross-legged on the open yard of the house, and, with hookah in hand, would listen to her sweet prattle, reciting the incidents of the day in the little family. Nor was she less useful than agreeable. She assisted her mother and grandmother in fifty little things in the house; and also in going on errands, bringing from the village shop mustard oil, salt, and other little articles for daily consumption; and taking to the fields the dinner of her father and her uncles."

We may here briefly remark that these characters are all carried off the scene under circumstances intended to be illustrative of Bengal society, which, though all natural in themselves, as we have said above, are inartistically arranged. Of the three brothers, Gayárám is killed by the bite of a snake; Kálamánik dies by the hands of the lattials of the Zemindar; and Badan is carried off by fever. Alanga, the mother, goes on pilgrimage, and dies of cholera at Jaggernath. The wayward Aduri becomes a Vaishnava, and disappears as a religious mendicant in the suspicious company of a man of that profession. Sundari dies of the epidemic fever of Burdwan. The hero dies heart-broken when the Bengal famine follows upon a long series of calamities, and obliges him to descend from the position of a peasant-cultivator to that of a coolie, or paid labourer, on the public relief works.

Much of such interest as the tale itself possesses centres in the little girl Málati. Her marriage gives the author the opportunity of describing many of the Hindoo customs in regard to that institution, and of introducing her into a family where the step-mother is the cause of as much misery as that relationship is of happiness in the family of the hero of the tale. The village of Durgangar, in which her husband lives, is subject to the disturbing influences of the Indigo factory, and Madhava, her husband, falls a victim to the violence of "Murray Sahib," the manager of the works. Málati herself is last seen in reduced circumstances, having after the death of her husband sold her small property, and returned to her native village.

"By selling her late husband's property she had got about one hundred rupees (£10), with part of which she traded, and part she

Digitized by Google

lent out on heavy interest. The trade which she carried on was this: she bought paddy (rice in the husk), turned it into rice, and sold it. The proceeds of this little trade, together with the interest of money lent out, were sufficent to supply her wants, and those of her son. The boy was able in a short time to earn a little money, about a shilling a month, by tending the cows of neighbours, and by gathering cow-dung every day, which Málati turned into cakes, and sold as fuel."

Of the events of rural life and of the accessory characters, having only space for one of each, we select the village schoolmaster and the harvest home.

"A VILLAGE SCHOOLMASTER IN BENGAL."

"As the redoubtable pedagogue of Kánchanpur, now in the act of smoking, is in a state of repose—and tobacco, they say, is a wonderful sedative—we shall make an attempt to photograph his likeness, which is not always practicable, especially when, urged by a tempest of passion—as was frequently the case—his body trembles in every inch with rage, and his cane descends, thump after thump, with electric rapidity, on the backs of his unfortunate pupils. From the form of one of his legs, and the position in which it was put, you might have inferred that he was lame, and the inference would have been confirmed by the sight of a crutch that lay beside him. His lameness, to say the truth, was of no ordinary kind; he could with difficulty go, with the help of his crutch, from one room of his house to another; and, as for going out into the street, he scarcely went out even once in six months. Owing to this bodily defect, he was always called *khondá mahásaya*, that is, the lame schoolmaster, in contra-distinction to the Bráhman pedagogue. His pupils often lent him a helping hand in going from room to room, and sometimes, I am sorry to say, assisted him to a fall, as a sort of retaliation for the caning they so frequently received from him. He was about forty years old, had a dark skin, a spare body, an aquiline nose, and a rather high forehead for a Bengali. He stooped a great deal. In addition to his lameness, he had another bodily defect, which considerably marred his influence, and made him often an object of derision—he spoke through his nose. When narrating the conversation he had with Badan, we found it impossible to represent his nasal intonation in the English language, though it would have been quite easy in Bengali. In uttering the words, 'How do you do?' Ráma Rúpa would say—'*know dno ynou dno?*' His nasal twang was so strong, that, if he were speaking at night in a dark room, he might be mistaken by children for a ghost—for Bengali ghosts speak strongly through the nose. . .

"But though a hopeless cripple as regards his body, and ghost-like in his speech, Ráma Rúpa had natural talents of no mean order. He was the first mathematician in the village. He had not only Subhankara, the Indian Cocker, at his fingers' ends, but was acquainted with the elements of the Víjaganita or Algebra. There was, indeed, another mathematician in the village who looked down

Digitized by Google

upon the pedagogue with perfect contempt—and that is our friend Dhumketu, the astrologer; but there was this difference between the two geniuses, that whereas the astrologer dealt in celestial mathematics, the schoolmaster applied his mathematics to things terrestrial. But Rámа Rúpa was not only mathematical, he was eminently logical. Though he had not read the *Sútras* of Gotama, he was an acute reasoner. Whenever the Christian missionary of Vardhamána came to the village in the course of his itineracy, he did not fail to pay a visit to the lame schoolmaster, who had many a tough argument with him; and the villagers always thought that the missionary was invariably worsted. Indeed, his reputation for logical subtlety was so great that it might be truly said of him that

> He was in logic a great critic,
> Profoundly skill'd in analytic;
> He could distinguish and divide
> A hair 'twixt south and south-west side;
> On either which he would dispute,
> Confute, change hands, and still confute.

Rámá Rúpa was a strict disciplinarian. He had by him constantly, besides his crutch, a thin but longish twig of bamboo, which often resounded, not only on the palms of his pupils' hands, but on their heads and backs; and sometimes also with cruel ingenuity he used to strike their knuckles, their knee-joints, and their ankles. You could hardly pass by the door of the house during school hours without hearing the *shop-a-shop, shop-a-shop* of the bamboo switch. But he had other ways of administering discipline. One famous mode of juvenile punishment was called *nádu-Gopál*, that is, Gopál (the god Krishna) with a sweetmeat in his hand. This consisted in making a boy sit on the ground with one leg in a kneeling posture; the two arms were then stretched, and a large brick was placed on each. In this posture a boy is expected to remain still for several hours. Should either of the bricks fall from the hand, down comes the bamboo switch on the pate of the delinquent. We shall mention only one other clause in Rámа Rúpa's penal code. The juvenile offender was handcuffed, and his feet were tied by strings to the trunk of the jack tree of which we have spoken. While the boy thus stood handcuffed and chained, the leaves of a stinging plant called *bichhuti* (*Tragia involucrata*) were applied to different parts of his body. Whoever has been stung by a wasp or a hornet can have some idea of the sensation produced by the application of *bichhuti* to the skin. The agony is intense: perfectly helpless, unable to run away, unable even to stroke with his hand the part stung, the boy can do nothing but shriek. In justice to the lame schoolmaster of Kánchanpur, I should here remark that the above disciplinary process was not the product of his own fertile brain; it is a time-honoured institution which has been handed down from generation to generation of Bengali village schoolmasters. . . .

"A few words on Rámа Rúpa's finances will conclude this chapter. The schooling fee was, on the average, one *anna* (a penny and halfpenny) a month per boy. Supposing he had thirty or

Digitized by Google

thirty-two boys—I don't believe he ever had more—his monthly income would amount to two rupées, or four shillings. Besides this he had a system of 'requisitions.' Most of the boys, when they came to the afternoon school—for the school was held first from early in the morning till about eleven o'clock, and again from three o'clock in the afternoon till candlelight—brought from their houses for their teacher either a betel-leaf, or a betel-nut, or a small ball of tobacco. In addition to these daily donations, every boy was expected to give to the *mahásaya* once a month a *sidá*, which consisted of a quantity of unboiled rice, with a suitable accompaniment of vegetables, split pulse, mustard oil, salt, and even clarified butter. All this, no doubt, made a considerable addition to his income of four shillings a month, yet it was quite insufficient to support the pedagogue, his wife and two children; the deficiency was supplied by the produce of about ten *bighás* of land which, as he was unable to cultivate them himself, he held in partnership with a neighbouring husbandman. . . . . .

"Such was the celebrated pedagogue of Kánchanpur, at whose feet Govinda was made to sit for instruction. What progress our hero makes in his studies, and how long he remains in the school, will form the subject of a future chapter; but in the meantime the attention of the reader must be drawn to some other matters."

"AN INDIAN HARVEST HOME."

"About a month after the Navánna, or the new rice, came the harvest, a time of joy to the peasantry. As it is of great importance to cut all the paddy at once, Badan obtained the help of his friends, and of those whose fields lay near his own, on condition that he would render to them the like assistance. Of these associates, the foremost was Padma Lochan Pál, who, ever since the murder of his second daughter, Yádumani, whose dead body was first discovered by Govinda, and brought up from the water by Kálamánik, had been greatly drawn towards Badan and his family. On the appointed day, they all repaired to the field with sickles, bullocks, ropes, &c., and commenced operations. The reapers were three in number—Badan, Kálamánik, and Padma. Squatting on the ground on their heels, they incessently plied the 'sharp-toothed sickle' to the cluster of paddy held by the left hand. The paddy stalks were tied into sheaves by the assistants; the sheaves were made into loads, put on pack-saddles, and carried home on the backs of bullocks. Kálamánik, on account of his prodigious strength, was the most successful of all the three reapers. With his huge hand he caught hold each time of a large quantity of the paddy stalks; pressed his lips together, putting them fairly inside the mouth; and cut the corn away with great force. *Mash! mash! mash!* the paddy fell rapidly before the sickle; and this music was greatly enlivened by the sounds of *umph! umph!* which ever and anon issued from Kálamánik's wide nostrils as from two subterranean caves. As soon as the pack-saddles were ready, they were put on the bullocks; and it was Govinda's business to see them safely landed at home, where

Digitized by Google

other husbandmen were waiting to stack them. Many a trudge Govinda had on these harvest days, with the loaded bullocks, from the paddy-field to the house, and from the house back to the paddy-field. He had, however, more leisure than the others, for his work began only when the paddy-loads were ready. During the interval he smoked and chatted merrily with the little boys and girls who had come for the gleanings; for it is a rule amongst Bengali Hindu husbandmen, as it was amongst the Jews of old, not to take up any little paddy stalk that falls from the pack-saddles either in the fields or on the roadside, but allow it to be gleaned by boys and girls, who usually exchange the gleanings of the day in the grocer's shop for parboiled peas fried in oil—a delicacy which makes its appearance in village shops at the harvest. There was one bright little girl there with whom Govinda talked oftener than with the rest; and she was the eldest daughter of Padma Lochan Pál, Dhanamani by name, the elder sister, though herself only eleven years old, of the lamented Yádumani. He gave her quantities of the *mudi* and *mudki* tied in his *gámchhá*, and handfuls of which he was every now and then putting into his mouth; and he often filled her little gleaning-basket—and it is not reckoned dishonourable for children of prosperous husbandmen to glean—with paddy-stalks from the bundles. The reapers, sheaf-binders, and other assistants, took their noon-day meal, which had been brought by Govinda, under a tree, not far from the field; and though no ox was killed and no bread of the 'whitest flour' baked, as in the days of Homer, there was as much joy in the hearts of these vegetable-eating and water-drinking peasants of Bengal as in those of the beef-eating and wine-bibbing swains of old Hellas. On such occasions Dhanamani sat beside her father and partook of the dinner, and went home when Govinda returned next with the laden bullocks.

"After gathering in the harvest, and arranging it in the open yard of his house in stacks, Badan, agreeably to previous arrangement, helped his neighbours in cutting their paddy. This being done, the process of threshing commenced. No flails or threshing machines of any sort are known to the peasantry of the Vardhamána district. They place on the ground a simple plank on an inclined plane; the thresher stands at the head of the plane, takes a sheaf of paddy by both his hands, and strikes it against the plank with all his force. Thump succeeds thump, till all the corn is beaten out of the paddy stalk. Should some grains of paddy, after the operation, remain on the stalk, the whole of the straw is laid out on the yard, and some oxen tied in a line to a post are made to tread it; and on such occasions, contrary to the Mosaic rule, the oxen are invariably muzzled, to prevent them from munching straw. The straw thus trodden upon is tied in wisps, and is called *lot*—so named from the circumstance that the straw has been tumbled about. This *lot* is sold dearer than the ordinary straw, and is used for thatching huts. The paddy is then stored up in the granary, and the straw stacked.

The harvest is followed by a festival, greatly enjoyed by the peasantry, and called *pitá sankránti*, or the feasts of cakes. It is so

Digitized by Google

called from *pitá*, cake, and *sankránti*, the last day of a month, as it always takes place at the end of the month *Pausha*, which comprises half of December and half of January. The festival lasts three days. Early in the morning of the first day of the feast, Alanga, Sundari, and Aduri bathed, and boiled different kinds of pulse-like grain, *kalái*, *barbati (Embelia basaal)*, *mug (Phaseolus aureus)*, which they formed into a sort thick paste. They next extracted the kernel of the cocoa-nut, mixed it with treacle, and fried it. They then took out a large quanity of rice, which had been previously pounded, made it into a paste, and formed it into innumerable small cups, which they filled with either various kinds of the prepared pulse, or the prepared kernel of the cocoa-nut, or cream, and covered them up. These rice balls were then put in a *hándi* of boiling water; and in a few minutes the *pitá* was fit to be eaten. These cakes are usually eaten with treacle. A larger sort of cakes is usually prepared, called *askes*, which are of two kinds, the *dry* and the *wet;* the former being eaten along with treacle, and the latter soaked in milk. A thinner species, called *saruchaklis*, is very much esteemed. Alanga made heaps of these rice-cakes; and they were greedily devoured by the members of the little household. On one of the festival days Alanga made a *pitá* of a monstrous size in the shape of a cat, which was offered to *Shashthi*, the protectress of children. These rude and somewhat unwholesome cakes may not suit the taste of refined palates, but they are vastly enjoyed by the peasantry, who get no harm by them. The feast of cakes is attended with games and sports similar to those which take place during the festival of the new rice. I had almost forgotten to mention that, in the evening of the first day of the feast, the peasant boys of Kánchanpur sang in chorus some doggrel verses addressed to the harvest month, describing its unnumbered blessings, and praying for its annual return."

The above quotations are calculated to give a fair impression of the work, and we trust to recommend it, if not to the ordinary novel reader, at any rate to every one desirous of obtaining a vivid and faithful picture of the inner life of the millions over whom England has, in God's providence, been called upon to rule, conveyed in a pleasing form. As written by a native, it can be read without the degree of mistrust which accompanies the enjoyment even of the cleverest fictions written by Englishmen, intended to be illustrative of foreign life, of which we may take "Haji Baba" as the ablest type, arising from the fact that the author himself can necessarily have but a partial acquaintance with his subject, and may have formed false impressions. And while the book is read in order to obtain an insight into native character, it is itself a proof how that character is being affected by English education and Christian teaching. If read with the recollection kept strongly in the mind that it is written by one born in Hindooism, and we believe in a rank of life little

Digitized by Google

above that which he describes, the reader cannot fail to feel that England has not been put in charge of India in vain.

On two points the writer corrects impressions generally entertained by the English in regard to Hindoo society. The sufferings of the widow and the character of the mahajan (money lender) are somewhat softened down in the author's pages. We would be glad in each case to quote his more favourable views of both, but can only find room for one, interesting as both are.

"Aduri's sorrow was, however, the gloomiest, though perhaps less disinterested than Alanga's. It was the blackness of dark despair. Her married life was now at an end. Though young, she must remain a widow all her life. Association with a husband is regarded as the *summum bonum* of womanly existence. Is life worth anything now that happiness has become impossible? What made her saddest was the horrible prospect of perpetual widowhood. Her sun had gone down while it was noon. Hope, that comes to all, never visited her. The rest of her life—if life it could be called—was to be one continued midnight, without the remotest prospect of a dawn. It is impossible not to sympathise with a Hindu widow. It is not that she is persecuted and tormented by her relations and friends—that is a fiction of foreign writers, of people unacquainted with Hindu life in its actual manifestations—but the peculiar wretchedness of her condition lies in this, that the fountain of her heart, with its affections and desires, is for ever dried up. She becomes a soulless thing, and her life a blank. Aduri did not, like Alanga, fill the house and the neighbourhood with her cries, nor did she expatiate in her lamentations on every good quality of her amiable husband. Such a thing would have been deemed indecent in a widow. Her grief was a silent grief. She sobbed day and night. She broke her ornaments, whether of conch-shell, or sealing wax, or silver; she broke the iron ring on her wrist, the symbol of wifehood; she no longer braided her hair; she gave up daubing the top of her forehead with vermilion, which distinguishes a Hindu wife from a Hindu widow; she gave up putting on *sátis* with coloured borders. Her share of the pleasures of life had been exhausted; her part on the theatre of life had been played out: henceforth, though in the world, she was not to be of the world.

"English people have, somehow or other, got the idea that a Hindu widow receives harsh and cruel treatment from the relations of her husband. This is not true. There are no doubt exceptional cases, but, as a general rule, Hindu widows are not only not ill treated, but they meet with a vast deal of sympathy. Old widows in a Bengali Hindu family are often the guides and counsellors of those who style themselves the lords of creation. We had the happiness of being acquainted with a venerable old Hindu widow who was not only the mistress of her own house, consisting of a considerable number of middle-aged men and women, but she was often the referee of important disputes in the village of which she was an inhabitant, and her decisions were received with the highest respect. Nor is

Digitized by Google

this an exceptional case. Old widows, provided they have intelligence and good character, assert, on account of their experience in life, their superiority over men younger than they. As to the privations of widows, a little too much is made of them. Besides the one supreme privation of having the fountain of their affections sealed up, the others, of which foreign writers make so much, are not worth speaking about. The most considerable of these minor privations is that only one meal is permitted them in twenty-four hours. But this restraint will cease to be regarded as a privation when it is considered that a widow's meal is usually larger in quantity and heavier in weight than that of a married woman; that the meal is taken in the afternoon not many hours before sleep; that most widows are sleek and stout; and that many of the strong and able-bodied peasants of the North-Western Provinces, and the Hindu Sepoys in the Bengal army, take only one meal in twenty-four hours. Let not the reader suppose that we are extenuating the misery of Aduri. Her case was truly pitiable. Though not anticipating unkind treatment from the rest of the family, she felt that she was socially dead; at any rate, that she was ALONE in the world."

On the whole the impression left on our mind by the work is one of decided encouragement. Apart from the example which the author presents in his own person, his book speaks of progress and improvement, and inspires hope. If the sutti is described, it is as a thing of the past (Vol. ii., p. 146), and many of the descriptions of wrong and evil are as of things passing away. If a picture is drawn of a model Zemindar, anxious for the good of his dependents, it is declared to be a portrait from life of a class still rare, but, "thanks to the spread of English education, daily on the increase." (Vol. ii. p. 195.) Recent legislation in behalf of the tenantry is described as eminently successful. The desire of the people for education, and their feelings towards the missionary as here represented, are auguries for good.

To those interested in female education in India the work will be a stimulant to fresh exertion. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of winning over to Christ those who exercise the influence which is attributed to the female characters in this book.

We recommend it to all as one that cannot fail to interest the thoughtful reader in a people whom their fellow-countryman has so faithfully described.

Digitized by Google

THE LAWLESSNESS OF RITUALISM.

Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism, discussed in Six Letters, addressed, by his permission, to the Right Hon. Lord Selborne. By Malcolm MacColl, M.A. Hayes. 1875.

The Edwardian Vestments. An Investigation into the History and Construction of the Ornaments-Rubric. By Henry Richmond Droop, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Hatchards. 1875.

The first and longest of Mr. MacColl's letters is occupied in an elaborate attempt to vindicate the Ritualists from the charge of lawlessness which has recently been preferred against them on no less an authority than that of Lord Selborne, and to fasten the same accusation on that party in the Church to which the Ritualists are most opposed.

Mr. MacColl's assertions are bold; his arguments are not devoid of ingenuity; and we are willing to believe that it would be difficult to advance more valid reasons in support of the cause which he advocates than those which are to be found in the volume before us. If then we are compelled to pronounce Mr. MacColl's laboured efforts to prop up the cause of Ritualism a signal failure, it is because, when judged out of the lips of one of its most ardent supporters, the cause which is espoused is found indefensible.

Mr. MacColl's first defence of his party for refusing to conform to some of the rulings of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council is found in the old and now thread-bare plea that they feel themselves conscientiously obliged to disown the authority of that tribunal in matters ecclesiastical. It would be a mere waste of time to expose the hollowness of this defence. Mr. MacColl, moreover, has kindly saved us this necessity; inasmuch as his naive assertion that "the objection to a particular Court on the ground of defective jurisdiction implies a willing submission to a Court not tainted with such defect," presents so singular a contrast to the tactics actually adopted by the party which he represents, as to savour rather of an ironical reply from an opponent than of a serious justification from an advocate.

We shall not follow Mr. MacColl in his coarse and petulant invectives against the Judicial Committee of Council in reference to the decision in the Gorham case. It appears to us that every minister, whether clergyman or layman, who, in his attempts to set at nought the decisions of the Supreme Court of Appeal, permits himself to indulge in such a statement as that

Digitized by Google

which we find in p. 17,—viz., that "the Privy Council, in order to save the Evangelical party, solemnly and deliberately declared that black was white,"—whilst he deprives himself of all claim to be regarded as a fair and impartial witness, does incalculable mischief to any cause of which he is regarded as a recognised exponent.

We have so recently expressed our views upon the question how far "omission" is fairly to be regarded as equivalent to "prohibition" in the exposition of the Rubrics, that we have no intention of examining at any length Mr. MacColl's arguments on this subject. We merely pause to observe that his attempt to prove its absurdity on the ground of the absence of any direction respecting the *manual actions* in the second Prayer-book of King Edward VI., and, as he might have added up to the final Revision of 1661, is a somewhat unfortunate one. Whether the manual actions are, or are not entitled to the degree of importance which was ascribed to them by the Puritan commissioners in the Savoy Conference, and which is now assigned to them by the party with which Mr. MacColl is identified, is a question which we do not propose to discuss. We confine ourselves to the simple statement that Dr. Stephen's argument in the case of *Sheppard* v. *Bennett*, so far as it was based upon the omission of the direction to perform certain manual actions during the Prayer of Consecration, was no *reductio ad absurdum*, as contended by Mr. MacColl (p. 38); but that the omission of any direction to perform those manual actions in the Prayer-book of 1552 was intentional, and was justly regarded as equivalent to prohibition. If we refer to the "oration against the Bill for the Liturgy," made by Dr. Scott, Bishop of Chester, in the year 1559, we shall find, as Dr. Stevens observed, that he takes exception to the Order for the Communion on the express ground that there was no direction in it for the priest to take the bread in his hands, or to break it. The ministers, at the Savoy Conference in 1661, expressed the same objection in the following words: "We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's breaking of the bread is not so much as mentioned." There is no direct reply recorded in Cardwell's "History of the Conferences" to this objection; but, as a matter of fact, in the last Revision, the direction for the performance of the manual actions, to which there is independent evidence that the Puritan party attached much importance as far as concerned the breaking of the bread before the people, was again inserted.

We have so recently discussed the history of the Ornaments Rubric in these columns that we feel no disposition to re-open that discussion on the present occasion. There is the less neces-

Digitized by Google

sity, moreover, for so doing, inasmuch as Mr. Droop's exhaustive pamphlet, to which we refer our readers with much satisfaction, supplies a more than sufficient answer to many of Mr. MacColl's arguments, and appears to us to establish, beyond all reasonable doubt, what was the contemporaneous exposition of the law as to the use of the vestments of the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI., from the publication of Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements in 1564, or rather in 1566, down to the time of the last Revision.

In order, however, that our readers may be able to form some idea for themselves of the straits to which Mr. MacColl has been reduced in order to establish his theory, that the design of the Advertisements and of the Canons was to insist upon a *minimum* of ritual, and not to exclude a higher ritual, we will furnish them with one or two specimens of his reasoning. It is directed by Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements that "the parson," if able, "shall preach in his own person every three months," or else shall "preach by another;" the further explanation being added to this injunction that "for want of able preachers," such parsons are to be "tolerated without penalty," so long as they preach in person or by a learned substitute once in every three months of the year. Mr. MacColl's argument is that the injunction respecting the *minimum* amount of preaching—viz., once in three months—is analogous to the *minimum* of ritual as represented by the surplice; and he argues that it is as unreasonable to suppose, because the cathedral clergy were ordered to use copes, and the parochial clergy surplices, in the ministration of the Communion, that therefore they were not to use albes and chasubles, as to suppose that because the parson was commanded to preach once in every three months, therefore he was forbidden to preach oftener.

Mr. MacColl, however, has another illustration derived from the Advertisements whereby to justify his *minimum* and *maximum* theory of ritual; and inasmuch as the second illustration of his theory is very characteristic of the manner in which some of the leading exponents of modern Ritualism are wont to cite their authorities, we will adduce it in his own words. Mr. MacColl first refers to the Rubric directing that two lessons should be read at morning and evening prayer daily throughout the year. He then observes that "concurrently with this Rubric the Advertisements sanctioned a minimum which fell short of it in the express permission" granted to the parochial and other clergy to read daily at the least *one* chapter of the Old Testament and *another* of the New. It is not therefore, as their Lordships allege, "assumed, without proof, that such a statute was framed so as to leave a choice between contrary interpretations."

Digitized by Google

We presume that no reader of this extract will doubt that Mr. MacColl cites Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements of 1564, authorising the clergy to read daily, at the least, *one* chapter of the Old Testament, and another of the New, in the *public services of the Church*, in the place of the *two* lessons appointed to be read at morning and at evening prayer. A single glance, however, at the Advertisements themselves on the part of any one possessed of an ordinary amount of common sense, and of acquaintance with the phraseology of the times, will suffice to dispel all doubt that such is not the meaning of the "protestation" to which Mr. MacColl refers. After a series of directions as to the *public* and *private* obligations of the clergy, amongst which will be found some respecting the *public* saying or singing of "common prayer," and others respecting the *private* studies of the clergy and their examination by the Bishop and the Archdeacon, there is added at the end a number of protestations, to be made by the clergy, amongst which one is found respecting the "plain, distinct, and audible" reading of the public Services of the Church, and another respecting the daily reading in private, "*with good advisement*," to the increase of his own personal knowledge, "at the least one chapter of the Old Testament, and another of the New."

Now, either Mr. MacColl has never referred to the Advertisements the plain and obvious meaning of which he has thus grossly misrepresented; or, having referred to them, he has failed to understand them, or has palpably misrepresented them. Whichever of these three horns he may elect on which to impale himself, we think he will best consult the interests of the case which he has undertaken to defend, if he abstains in future from illustrations of his *maximum* and *minimum* theory of Ritual derived from the Advertisements of 1564; and, more especially, if he abstains from such assertions as that which he bases upon the palpably absurd inference which he has here drawn,—viz., that there is here "positive proof" against the dictum of the Judicial Committee that it is not to be assumed, without proof, that a penal statute was so framed as to "leave a choice between contrary interpretations."

In regard to the assertion made by Mr. MacColl that he presumes that "no lawyer would dispute his assertion that the Advertisements of Elizabeth had no force in law,—at least, before the Canons of 1603, if then, we may remark (1) that this is a somewhat singular assertion to make in the course of a letter addressed to the distinguished lawyer who had recently given, and had still more recently defended the opposite opinion; (2) that other lawyers, not less distinguished, concurred with Lord Selborne in the opinion given in May, 1866,

Digitized by Google

and in its defence;[a] and (3) that Mr. Droop, in the able pamphlet to which we have already referred, observes as follows: "The earliest indication I have met with of any question being raised as to the ornaments of Edward's First Book not having been superseded by the Advertisements, is contained in a book presented in manuscript to Archbishop Whitgift in 1584, by Robert Beal, Clerk of the Council." (P. 31.)

Mr. MacColl's argument in support of his assertion that the chasuble, alb, and tunicle, were in use in England after the issuing of Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements, appear to us singularly unfortunate. We will take one or two examples. Mr. MacColl appeals to a letter addressed by Zanchius in 1571 to Queen Elizabeth, protesting against the re-introduction of "the ridiculous and execrable garments of the ungodly mass-priests." These, he argues, could not have been the surplice, "for the mass was never celebrated in a surplice, but almost invariably in the chasuble, etc., especially when the celebrant was a priest, as distinct from Bishop; and the mass-priests were priests simply, not Bishops." Unfortunately for Mr. MacColl's argument the letter of Zanchius has special reference to the vestments of Bishops, and his complaint is that "godly Bishops" should be *required* to put on "the ridiculous and execrable garments of the ungodly mass-priests." Now we presume that even Mr. MacColl will scarcely expect his readers to believe that Queen Elizabeth required the Bishops to put on any other vestments than those which the Advertisements specify. Moreover, those who are at all acquainted with the contemporaneous history of the times will be at no loss to perceive that Zanchius, in all probability, referred to that vestment controversy which is well known to have existed in England at this period, and which, it is quite certain, was in no wise connected with the use of chasubles, albs, or tunicles. If, then, we observe (1) that Zanchius makes special mention of "white linen garments;" (2) that he refers particularly to the case of Bishops; and (3) that his objection is made, not to vestments adopted voluntarily in accordance with Mr. MacColl's *maximum* theory, but to vestments "commanded" and "required," both on the part of Bishops, and also of other ministers, it seems to follow, as a matter of necessity, that the reference of Zanchius must have been, not to chasubles, albs, and tunicles, which, whether adopted or not, were certainly not *commanded*, but to the surplices of the parochial clergy, to which Sampson and Humphrey had recently

[a] See "The Ornaments of the Minister. Further Reasons for the opinion given May, 1866, by Sir Roundell Palmer, Sir H. M. Cairns, Mr. Mellish, and Mr. Barrow." Rivingtons, 1867.

Digitized by Google

demurred, and to the episcopal habits which, as supposed relics of popery, Hooper, not many years previously, had refused to wear, except on public occasions.

Another of Mr. MacColl's arguments is derived from a letter addressed by Beza to Bullinger, bearing date 3rd September, 1566, in which he speaks of "teachers of the pure Gospel" being turned out of their offices unless they will "resemble the priests of Baal in their square caps, bands, surplices, hoods, and other things of the like kind." Mr. MacColl's argument is that the word translated "hood" is in the Latin *casula, chasuble;* and hence he argues that "two years subsequently to the publication of the Advertisements, chasubles were in use. It is difficult to suppose that an argument so palpably puerile can be seriously maintained. It will more than suffice, in reply, to observe (1) that those who base such a conclusion upon the technical accuracy of foreigners respecting the ritual of the English Church can have but little experience in controversies of this description; (2) that the argument again proves too much, seeing that whatever may have been the *maximum* of ritual permitted or encouraged, Mr. MacColl's own theory requires that the *minimum* was deemed sufficient, and consequently that no "godly teachers" could have been *deprived of their offices* for not wearing *chasubles;* and (3) had Mr. MacColl been at all conversant with the history of the Advertisements, he would have been aware that, as it has been repeatedly pointed out by Archdeacon Harrison in his "Historical Enquiry," the Advertisements could not have been published until after the 28th March in the year 1566;[b] and consequently that even if Beza, writing in the autumn of that year, was in possession of information respecting the general effect of those Advertisements upon the Ritual of the English Church, his letter cannot be adduced as evidence of the use of chasubles "*two years* after the publication of the Advertisements."

One more quotation from this portion of Mr. MacColl's book, and we have done with his violent and, we are constrained to add, ignorant invectives against the Judicial Committee of Privy Council on the ground of their decision in the Purchas Case, as to the illegality of the use of the vestments prescribed in King "Edward Sixth's first Prayer-book." It was alleged by their Lordships in the judgment in that case, that "if the minister is to wear a *surplice* at all times of his ministration, he cannot wear an *alb* and *tunicle* when assisting at the Holy Communion," and "that if he is to celebrate the Holy Communion in a *chasuble*, he cannot celebrate in a *surplice*." Mr. MacColl is of opinion that their Lordships' argument is "as fatal to the black

[b] "See Historical Enquiry into the True Interpretation of the Rubrics." 1845. P. 122.

Digitized by Google

gown in the pulpit as to the chasuble at the altar." We should have thought that a writer on points of ritual would have possessed sufficient information to have guarded him against so singular a blunder. Is Mr. MacColl really ignorant that the question at issue is whether preaching is, or is not, included amongst those ministrations of the Book of Common Prayer, to which the Sacraments, Rubric, and the Advertisements refer? Had he ever perused Archdeacon Harrison's elaborate "Enquiry," he would have been aware that it was not without reason that the learned writer arrived at the conclusion that, amidst all the discussions which the question of vestments has raised in the Church of England, "there is nothing in any Rubric, Order, or Canon, positively to *require* the use of the surplice or the gown (in preaching), or to *forbid* the use of either." (p. 184.)

Notwithstanding, however, the fatal results involved in its admission, Mr. McColl generously condescends to "make their Lordships a present of their assumption for the sake of argument." He goes on, however, to allege that, "in matter of fact, the assumption is purely gratuitous." "'Surplice' and 'alb,'" he says, "are but two names for one and the same vestment, which the priest was not only permitted, but required, to wear, under the chasuble at the celebration of the Holy Communion."

We might content ourselves here with referring our readers to the statement made by Mr. MacColl, to which allusion has already been made,—that "the mass was never celebrated in a surplice, but almost invariably in the chasuble." At present, however, we are content to deal with the simple question, whether the "surplice" and "alb" are or are not "two names for one and the same vestment."

Now we do not need to be reminded that the alb may be justly described as a vestment resembling the surplice, or even, in loose phraseology, as a surplice with tight sleeves,[c] girded closely to the body.[d] The question here raised is, whether, in rubrical language, the alb and the surplice are the same or different vestments. And to this inquiry we should have imagined that the Rubric prefixed to the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer in the second Prayer-book of King Edward VI. contained a sufficiently decisive answer. It is as follows: "The minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither *alb*, vestment, nor cope: but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest, or deacon, he shall have and wear a *surplice* only." It is, of course, in vain to allege that there is

[c] "Manicæ quoque tam albæ, quam etian tunicellæ convenienter debent esse strictæ." Durandus lib. iii., cap. 3.

[d] "Rursus alba cingulo stringitur." Ib.

Digitized by Google

ground for supposing that the surplice was, in ancient times, not different from the alb. It would be equally fair to allege that the cope is the same as the chasuble. The question is whether the words alb and surplice did, or did not, designate the same vestment in the phraseology of the English Church of the sixteenth century; in other words, whether the "ignorance" which Mr. MacColl imputes to the Judicial Committee, "that surplice and alb are interchangeable terms," is not rather his own than that of their Lordships. We should recommend Mr. MacColl, before he again constitutes himself, the final Court of Appeal from the decisions of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, to make himself somewhat better acquainted with the rudiments of the subject on which he undertakes to adjudicate.

Some amount of importance has reasonably been attached to the omission of the words "at the time of the Communion," in the Ornaments' Rubric, as it now stands, as tending to show that the vestments of the minister were to be the same *in all his ministrations;* in other words, that no distinctive Eucharistic vestment was any longer to be worn. Mr. MacColl, in order to blunt the edge of this argument, urges that *other* words were also omitted: viz., "in the Church;" and argues that both clauses were omitted at the last revision "because it was found exceedingly hard to get the Puritan clergy to wear even the surplice" in the church, "and quite impossible to get them to wear it out of the church,—at funerals, for example." What Mr. MacColl means by the words "for example" is best known to himself. But unless he is prepared with evidence to show that the "Puritans," as a body, availed themselves of the liberty which the Rubric then, as now, allowed, of going "either into the church, or towards the grave," and invariably adopted the latter of these alternatives, we are altogether unable to perceive the force of his reasoning even as applied to the exceptional case of funerals; nor can we consider it a probable supposition that the "Puritan" who refused to wear the surplice at "the grave," was more likely to have worn it "in the church."

A considerable portion of Mr. MacColl's book is occupied with an elaborate attempt to justify the adoption of the so-called "eastward position" in the celebration of the Holy Communion. We abstain from following him, at any length, on this subject,—partly because it has already been so fully discussed in the pages of this periodical, but, chiefly, because we think that Mr. MacColl has adduced little, if anything, which is worthy of serious consideration.

A few illustrations, in support of this conclusion, must suffice. Mr. MacColl attaches much importance to the well-known proposal of the ministers at the Savoy Conference, that the officiating

Digitized by Google

clergyman should turn himself to the people "throughout the whole ministration," and to the answer returned by the Bishops that "the minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration;" but that when speaking *to* them it is convenient that he should turn to them, and when speaking *for* them to God, that they should all turn another way. Mr. MacColl's version of this objection and reply is,—that "the Puritans objected then, as their representatives object now, to the celebrant facing in the same direction as the congregation;" and "that justice to the great men who represented the Church of England at the Savoy Conference must force us to the conclusion that they meant what they said when they declared that the proper position of the celebrant is to stand in front of the altar in those parts of the Communion office in which he is addressing Almighty God on behalf of the congregation." Had the "great men" of whom Mr. MacColl speaks really said what he has been pleased to put into their mouths, it would then be a simple act of justice to their memory to believe that "they meant what they said." Inasmuch, however, as they *said* nothing of the kind,—the words "in front of the altar" being a pure invention of the writer,—and, inasmuch as we possess more than abundant proof from contemporaneous sources of the more diversified kind, that they did not *mean* it; and further, inasmuch as, had they meant it, they would have been unable to give legal expression to their views when the revised Prayer-book was submitted to the consideration of the two Houses of Parliament, we have nothing further to remark on the subject than to advise Mr. MacColl, on future occasions, first to ascertain, and then correctly to represent his facts, ere he proceeds to draw from them such inferences as may suit the particular purpose for which he cites them.

The pictorial evidence to which Mr. MacColl alludes, in support of the eastward position, has been examined by several writers. It is well known by all who have had occasion to investigate this subject, not only that evidence of this character is peculiarly open to misconception, but also that the same evidence is adduced as conclusive on opposite sides. The controversy which has been recently waging over the frescoe in the hypogene Church of San Clemente may be cited by way of illustration of this statement. The frontispiece of Sparrow's Rationale, to which Mr. MacColl appeals, was discussed some years ago, amongst other similar engravings, in a pamphlet entitled, "The North Side of the Table." It is there observed[*] (1) that the plate has *no reference whatever to the administration*

[*] See "The North Side of the Table," p. 92.

Digitized by Google

of the Holy Communion; and (2) that the north side of the Table was included in the sketch. It was also observed,—in regard to the inference drawn by Dr. Littledale, as now by Mr. MacColl, from the fact that a book is represented in the centre of the Table,—that, in a similar engraving in "Burnet's History of the Reformation," which represents the Communion vessels upon the Table, there is a book at or near the centre of the Table, but that there is also a second book at the north side of it, and a Bishop at that part of it, with his face looking southwards.

The appeal made by our modern Ritualists to the Abbey Dore Service, recently republished by Mr. Russell, has been examined so fully in two articles on "The Ritual Controversy" in the April and May numbers of this journal, that it is wholly superfluous to refer again to a document which Mr. MacColl deems so "decisive" on this and other points, further than to say that we entirely endorse the opinion which he has expressed, that "it is necessary to read the whole of Mr. Fuller Russell's pamphlet in order to appreciate the cumulative force of the evidence."

We pass over Mr. MacColl's remarks on "Judicial Partiality," and upon "the Archbishops and the Church Association," with only one observation; and that is, that if any doubt still lingers in the mind of any candid and well-informed persons respecting the justice of the accusation of "lawlessness" which Lord Selborne has preferred against the Ritualists, we should recommend such persons to cast their eyes over this portion of Mr. MacColl's laboured attempt to vindicate them from the charge.

We have left ourselves but little space to consider Mr. MacColl's notions about "Sacerdotalism," or the opinions upon that subject which he is pleased to impute to his opponents. Mr. MacColl seems to think that those who dissent from his views have no alternative but to call in question the Sacerdotalism of the Old Testament dispensation, or to admit that of the New; and he seems, moreover, to think that because Mr. Martineau is of opinion that the sacramental principle and the doctrine of mediation "amount to a reversal of the very essence of Christianity," and further, because "Mr. Martineau is a Unitarian," that therefore those who deny his views of Sacerdotalism are drifting into the same errors as those into which both he and they believe that Mr. Martineau has fallen.

It is hard to deal seriously with a writer who gravely propounds such utterly wild and unfounded notions, and we really think that it would be a waste of time and labour were we to undertake to refute them. Mr. MacColl's views of inspiration are as loose as are his views of Sacerdotalism. According to his views, "as far as internal evidence alone goes, the Bible is nothing more than a haphazard collection of writings, which the art of the binder

Digitized by Google

has made into one book." (P. 257.) We are indebted to Mr. MacColl for the singular discovery that Balaam was the author of some of the "writings" contained in the Old Testament; and for the information, conveyed in the form of dogmatic assertion, that the author of the Book of Job "did not belong to the Commonwealth of Israel."[f]

Proceeding from the question of Inspiration and Canonicity to the doctrine of the Eucharist, we find Mr. MacColl expressing his conviction that at no period in the reign of Edward VI., or of that of Elizabeth, would "belief even in Transubstantiation have disqualified a clergyman for office in the Church of England, *provided he took care not to force his belief on the understanding and consciences of others.*" (P. 294.) Mr. MacColl's notions of "disqualification" are, we presume, somewhat singular; and we trust that they are restricted to a small minority even of that section of the English Church which he professes to represent. We content ourselves with the two following extracts, the one from the twenty-eighth Article of 1571 (with which the twenty-ninth Article of 1552 substantially corresponds), and the other from the so-called Black Rubic of the second Prayer-book of King Edward VI.[g]

(1) "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

(2) "As concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

It may be that many, if not "a large majority" of the clergy,

---

[f] We by no means design to assert the contrary. It is quite possible, and even probable that the Book of Job may have been written in the Patriarch's own country, and by one of his own descendants. It is possible, however, *pace* Mr. MacColl, that we may be indebted for the actual form in which the book has been transmitted to posterity, to a Palestinian Hebrew of a later age. Our objection, in this instance, is not to the view maintained by Mr. MacColl, if propounded as his own opinion, but to that dogmatism which pervades the whole of this volume, and which is so commonly the concomitant of a limited acquaintance with the subject of discussion.

[g] It is due to Mr. MacColl to state that we base our objection to his statement upon the former more than upon the latter of the two quotations, and that we refer rather to the time of Queen Elizabeth than of Edward VI., because it is doubtful to what extent the Articles of 1552 received the subscription of the clergy, or the Prayer-book of 1552 came into general use. Moreover, it is clear that large numbers of clergy were ready to re-affirm the corporal presence in the Eucharist, in the Convocation which was assembled a few months after the death of King Edward VI.

Digitized by Google

in the time of Queen Elizabeth, in spite of their subscription to the twenty-eighth Article, "did believe in Transubstantiation;" and none who are acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of that period, will doubt that such instances are amply attested. The same belief may exist also in our own days. We trust, however, that the number is small, either of clergy or of laity, who would venture to express their conviction that after solemn subscription to the twenty-eighth Article, such belief constituted no disqualification for "office in the Church of England," in the judgment of those who had subscribed it, or was not regarded as a disqualification on the part of those whose duty it was to exact the subscription of others.

There is little which is deserving of notice in the remaining portion of Mr. MacColl's letters, on any other ground than that of the general repugnance of his views with the prevailing spirit, and, as we believe, with the express letter of the teaching of the Church to which he belongs. One of the most melancholy statements contained in this book, is that which we find in p. 348, in reference to the assaults which have been made on revealed religion in several recent publications, and amongst others in a volume which has been lately reviewed in these columns, entitled "Supernatural Religion." Mr. MacColl's words are as follows: "The Christianity assailed in these and similar works is, I am bound to say, very unlike the Christianity in which I believe, and in whose consolations I hope to die." Our readers will probably remember that in one of the most widely circulated of the works to which Mr. MacColl here alludes,—viz., "Supernatural Religion,"—there is found not only an elaborate assault upon the reality, and even the possibility of miracles, and a formal denial as well of the historical truth as of the inspiration of the Gospel history, but further, a refusal on the part of the writer, throughout a considerable portion of his work, to commit himself to a belief even in the existence of a personal God. This is "the Christianity" which is assailed in "Supernatural Religion,"—to deal only with one of the works to which Mr. MacColl refers,—and it is in reference to this assault upon everything which the believer holds dear in this life, and upon every hope which he entertains for another, that Mr. MacColl has thought fit to express his opinion that the Christianity thus assailed is "very unlike the Christianity in which he believes, and in whose consolations he hopes to die." It is no mere form of speech when we express our sincere hope that Mr. MacColl, in this as in other instances to which we have had occasion to allude, may be able to shelter himself behind the plea of ignorance on subjects with which he professes acquaintance.

Mr. MacColl's attack upon the two Primates of the English

Digitized by Google

Church, on the ground of their opinions on the subject of confession and absolution, affords another illustration of the manner in which he, in common with others of the Ritualistic school, reverently and gladly "submit themselves" to the "godly judgments" of the "chief ministers" of their Church. The letter (No. 5) consists of little more than the ordinary misrepresentations of the doctrine and practice of the English Church, with which our readers are so abundantly familiar. Of this character are the following:—

(I.) Mr. MacColl, when noticing the direction to the priest in the office for the Visitation of the Sick, "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, "not only conveniently omits all reference to the words which immediately follow, "If he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter;" but omits also to notice the very important fact, so far as the question of "*auricular* confession," of which he professes to treat, is concerned, that the Office for the Visitation of the Sick presupposes the presence of *witnesses;* and that there is no intimation whatever, throughout the whole of it, that such witnesses ought to withdraw during "the special confession" to which it refers.

(II.) Amongst the "formal and authoritative documents" to which Mr. MacColl appeals, he adduces (1) an inquiry contained in the Injunctions set forth in the *first year of King Edward VI.* —a somewhat remarkable appeal on the part of one who has previously (pp. 26, 27) described that Sovereign as a "pedantic boy," completely turned by the artful flatteries of men, who, if Mr. MacColl is to be trusted, were either themselves "bent on overthrowing the constitution of the Church," or were associated with men who were so minded; and (2) quotations having reference generally to "the power of the keys," the exercise of which we must presume that Mr. MacColl really believes, or wishes his readers to believe, consists, and was held by those whose writings he quotes, to consist in receiving private Confessions and in pronouncing Sacramental Absolutions.

(III.) In the face of the well-known facts (1) that the direction which is contained in the First Prayer-book of King Edward VI. respecting the use of the form of Absolution in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick "in all private confessions" was omitted in 1552, and never afterwards restored; (2) that not only no other form of absolution was substituted in its place, but that the following clause was inserted in the "warning" in the Communion Office, "that by the ministry of God's Word he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution;" and (3) that that portion of the warning which had reference to "auri-

Digitized by Google

cular and secret confession to the priest" was also omitted in 1552, and never afterwards restored,—in the face, we say, of these combined facts, Mr. MacColl has the hardihood to assert that "to the mind of any one *not blinded by prejudice or ignorance*, the Exhortation in the Communion Office plainly advises private confession, *to be followed by the only form of private absolution prescribed by the Church* to all who have any scruples about the fitness for partaking of the Sacrament."[h] We leave it to our readers to decide on whose part is the "prejudice" or the "ignorance" which is involved in the adoption or the rejection of Mr. MacColl's theory respecting the use of the "only form of private absolution prescribed by the Church."

We purposely refrain from any attempt to vindicate the Evangelical clergy from Mr. MacColl's direct or indirect assaults. He is pleased to express a charitable hope that he will "not give offence to anyone in saying that the Evangelicals, as a party, are not trained in scientific theology." We have already afforded our readers sufficient opportunity of arriving at some idea of Mr. MacColl's notions about "scientific theology;" and we think we may safely presume upon their concurrence with the writer when he expresses his opinion that to be esteemed by Mr. MacColl "a scientific theologian" is one of the last objects at which any man of reason and education is likely to aim.

We leave it to the Dean of Ripon and to Canon Swainson to take notice, if they should think it worth their while, of Mr. MacColl's attack upon their orthodoxy in regard to the attributes of our Lord's resurrection body; in the course of which argument he appears to us to have lost sight of the existence of the Fourth Article of Religion. For our own part, we need no other illustration of the character and extent of Mr. MacColl's "scientific theology" than we find in the following remarkable passage in his "Rationale" of the eastward position respecting the realization of the presence of God: "*It is impossible to realize His presence at all, unless we think of Him as localized.*" As, however, it is possible that some hitherto "untrained" minds may desire a further acquaintance with that "scientific theology" in which Mr. MacColl appear to be a proficient, we will adduce one more extract which will suffice at once as an illustration of Mr. MacColl's skill in Biblical exegesis, and also of the strength of occult evidence which yet remains to be adduced in support of the "eastward position." Having first informed his readers that Daniel found it a help to his devotion to image Jehovah as

[h] It is almost needless, we presume, to observe that the italics in the above quotation are ours—not Mr. MacColl's.

Digitized by Google

having "placed His name" on "Mount Zion,"[1] Mr. MacColl proceeds thus: "And he chose to be cast into the den of lions rather than give up to him, doctrinally, the 'eastward position'"!!!

Having been constrained to demur to very much of the contents of the volume before us, we are relieved by the reflection that in the "Conclusion" we find much in which we heartily concur.

First, Mr. MacColl apologizes to Lord Selborne, not only for the "unconscionable length" of his letter, but also for "some expressions which it was impossible to correct." We fully endorse the propriety of this apology; and we merely suggest for Mr. MacColl's consideration, whether it would not have been more becoming on the part of a clergyman to have abstained from the use of the obnoxious expressions, than to be constrained to apologize for their introduction. Secondly, Mr. MacColl humbly begs pardon, for whatever he has said which can give legitimate offence to anyone; in reference to which request we will say no more than that it is one for which there was much need; and we trust the writer will give proof of the sincerity of his regret by abstaining from a repetition of the offence.

Lastly, Mr. MacColl expresses his conviction that he has undertaken "a thankless office." With every disposition to prolong our concurrence with the writer throughout the concluding pages of these volumes, we are constrained to demur to the justice of the last of his self-accusations. Viewed in the interests of Ritualism, we admit that Mr. MacColl's self-imposed task may be fairly described as "a thankless office," inasmuch as he has, in our judgment, signally failed to make good his ground. When regarded, however, from another point of view, Mr. MacColl may, we think, reflect with satisfaction on having done his "little best to advance the cause of truth," inasmuch as he has given ample proof of the miserable shifts to which a writer, by no means devoid of natural shrewdness, is compelled to have recourse, when he undertakes to become the exponent of the miserable "Ritualism" of the nineteenth century, and the apologist of the unbridled "lawlessness" of those who are its champions.

[1] We do not know whether we wrong Mr. MacColl by the supposition that the allusion here is to the site of the temple. If so, we would remind him that that site is generally supposed to have been on Mount Moriah, not on Mount Zion.

Digitized by Google

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INSTITUTION FOR THE THEOLOGICAL PREPARATION OF THE CLERGY.

AN APPEAL.

SURELY the time has at length come when the Evangelical body should take into serious consideration the peculiarity of their position in the National Church, and make a corresponding effort to ascertain and discharge the specific duty which it imposes on them.

They hold fast to the particular doctrines, with regard to personal salvation, which, under God, first distinctly exposed and then effectively subverted the usurped authority of the Church of Rome over the human conscience in this country. They adhere, without reserve or misgiving, to the doctrinal settlements of the Reformation, anxious only that whatever of cognate matter is to be found in the Word of God should be brought forth and applied, not to reverse or alter, but to expand and perfect. Alone of all existing parties are they fully understood and thoroughly trusted by the laity in general, Dissenters as well as Churchmen. The Bible is still the religion of England, the nation is still Protestant at the core, and the Evangelical element in the National Church has the popular confidence and sympathy, because it is felt that they receive from the Word of God whatever they profess, and that they are thoroughly loyal to the Scriptural principles on which the Church was remodelled by the Reformers, and gradually settled by their successors.

A party thus placed and regarded have capacities for acting and influencing, which cannot but be potent and of a value indefinitely important. They invest it with a possibility of intervention that is momentous, and with a corresponding responsibility that is grave,—at this crisis at least, when the condition of the Church is such as to endanger the respect, perplex the mind, and shake the confidence of the nation.

The notorious distemper of Ritualism has thoroughly tested the moral and spiritual temperament, the religious tastes, and the dogmatic knowledge of the clergy as a body. Evident it is that principles and practices branded in the popular mind as Roman Catholic and superstitious, are partly tolerated, partly misunderstood, and very generally condoned by a large proportion of the mature members of the body, while by individuals who are younger they are again and again adopted and practised. For sometime this has been suspected, long enough, we fear, for the suspicion to engender a dry rot in those national habits of thinking and feeling with regard to the Church, which constitute the living supports of the existing Establishment as a national institution.

Digitized by Google

The best friends at once of the Church and of the country are convinced that some effectual steps should be taken to arrest the malady, by the suppression, if possible, of Ritualism; and efforts to that end have been devised and carried out. It is obvious that the open and direct assertion of offensive doctrine and the public practice of offensive forms of devotion, on the part of the clergy, are, to a certain extent, within the correction of legislative enactment and judicial decision. In a general endeavour to obtain in Parliament a suitable law for their repression, and to exact at the hands of ecclesiastical judges and officials the enforcement of it, the individuals composing the Evangelical party may co-operate with their fellow-citizens. It might be inexpedient, if not somewhat odorous of sedition, to have recourse to party combinations for the achievement of whatever can be sufficiently secured by the ordinary social efforts of the community at large. We, however, have conceived of Ritualism as of a disease in the Church. Of disease there are the cause and the effects. If it be the vocation of the public to deal with the latter, that is, with the outward symptoms and ravages of Ritualism, by way of repression, it may be the office of the Evangelical party to direct their attention to the former, and to try and mitigate some of the causes of the spread of Ritualism in the English Church. Now that Ritualism is in flower in many parts, and bearing fruit in others, and thus in the exertion of its attractions, we see it to be such that it has but to manifest itself to engender a congenial taste, and to spread infection. Immediate devices, therefore, are seasonable and justifiable in order, as soon as possible, to suppress its self-manifestation in the Church, that its diffusion be arrested therein. But for the extirpation of a taste for Ritualism where it has already been engendered, and for dealing with that specific feature in the condition of the clergy to which the very general toleration and rapid diffusion of Ritualism are to be traced, a specific device is not likely to be discovered without serious consideration, or applied at an instant.

The creation of a taste for Ritualism is due to more than one cause. We fully admit that the peculiarities of Ritualism, in principle and in practice, are congenial with certain cravings of the natural mind of man: between them there is a positive affinity. But we do not hesitate to assert that the astonishingly rapid spread of this disease in England is to be traced especially to the *professional ignorance of the clergy.* Disabled, in consequence, the young official finds himself in a distressing difficulty at this special era, when activity in his profession, of some type, is generally expected. Responsible for the instruction and spiritual guidance of his parishioners, and yet ignorant of what

Digitized by Google

he has to teach, and at a loss on all sides how to instruct or advise in spiritual things, what is he to do? His neighbour is a Ritualist. In his practices he finds what is at once within the compass of his own comprehension and powers of execution. That enterprising and unhesitating innovator multiplies the church services, makes them entertaining, and succeeds in interesting and assembling some of his own parishioners. Such a course would furnish himself with professional occupation, it would pacify in some degree his sense of duty, and it would not be disagreeable, or difficult, or onerous. Thereupon at last, though perhaps of Evangelical predilections originally, he tries to imitate the Ritualist, succeeds in his attempt, and speedily becomes entangled in the same course. Had he known what to teach and how to occupy himself legitimately in his parish, had he been acquainted with the principles that underlie Ritualism, known their previous history and perilous fruits, known the Scriptural doctrines and Church of England principles which unite to contradict and confute them, and thus been guarded and fortified by a professional instruction suited to the era, instead of falling as the victim, he might have stood forth as the antagonist of his Ritualistic neighbour. It is also chiefly to *professional ignorance* that we trace the constancy with which the majority of the clergy throughout the country seem to support the admitted advocates of Ritualistic practices, or those disposed to tolerate them or compromise objections, whenever there is a clerical division upon the subject. They have no doubt a sort of clannish prejudice against their Low Church brother, who directs his efforts chiefly to the exposition and application of the experimental doctrines of salvation, and they have also a taste for the externals of Ritualism which is more or less akin in origin and in spirit to their prejudice. Still they repel the idea of making common cause with what is indisputably Romish, and in their simplicity and blindness they deny that the specific effort of the Ritualistic movement is towards Rome. Ignorance, in fact, of the specific character and tendency of Ritualistic principles and observances, for which they have a taste, and of the Scriptural doctrines and practices for which these are substituted, against which they foster a blind prejudice, is the real explanation of their conduct, and, apparently, its only excuse. We are neither irrational nor calumnious in asserting that the majority of the clergy are *professionally ignorant*. It could not be otherwise in the absence of any adequate provision for the professional instruction of candidates for ordination, and in the presence of the fact that for generations few candidates possessing a degree at one of the Universities have ever been rejected on the score of professional ignorance. Not many years

Digitized by Google

ago, a Bishop's Chaplain examined seven candidates (some for deacons' and some for priests' orders) for ordination, and he reported to the Bishop that not one of them had given a rational answer to the interrogatory, "What is the view which you hold of the Atonement?" The Bishop (once himself a professor of divinity), notwithstanding, ordained them all, on the ground that their services as curates were required by the respective clergymen by whom they had been engaged. The Chaplain himself was our informant, and we need not add another word to illustrate the facility with which those incapable, through ignorance, of teaching, obtained authority to teach in the Church a few years ago. With the fact that no adequate provision for the professional instruction of persons destined to the sacred function is made, every clergyman is acquainted, and every parent of a clergyman sufficiently interested in his son to inquire into his studies at the University and afterwards. No one disputes the fact, and all who reflect deplore it. Individuals of a certain native power of mind, moral and intellectual, by private efforts, acquire more or less theological knowledge, and are sometimes distinguished by the possession of such an acquirement. But in the majority, who probably adopt the clerical profession in the first instance at least simply as a means of subsistence, such original force of mind, enterprise, and patient industry are not to be expected. Besides, was there ever a self-created theologian who did not regret the absence of that foundation which an adequate theological course before Ordination would have furnished? Candour, however, as well as our ultimate object, constrains us to add that the ignorance which we chiefly and specifically lament is not that of some theological scheme of knowledge and thought, or of some doctrinal system: it is ignorance, in the clergy, of Scriptural dogma, especially of that in connection with the personal salvation of man, by the radiance of which the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome were exposed at the Reformation, and the liberty and enjoyment of the salvation revealed by the apostolic doctrine established in this country.

What do these considerations suggest? An attempt to provide for the proper theological instruction of the clergy. A body of clergy, loyal to the settlements in doctrine and worship at the Reformation, and well versed in the contents of Scripture, and in Church history and of sound piety, once diffused in England, would speedily create an atmosphere so luminous and so wholesome, that the taste for Ritualism might be expected to perish eventually, together with its practice, private as well as public. The simple manifestation of a positive effort to establish an institution for the training of such a type of clergymen, were it

Digitized by Google

such as to give satisfaction to the common mind, would serve in some measure to restore confidence in the future of the Church of England.

But how is such an Institution to be provided? This is not to be expected of the clergy at large, for they at present are most seriously divided among themselves, and never would unite in any common method of theological instruction which should be of the right type and quality. Neither is this to be expected of the Bishops. They are selected from the most prominent of the clergy, and are as divided as the clergy themselves with regard to Christian doctrine and worship. They would not consent to any plan of theological instruction without the intervention of *compromises*. These compromises would be such as to deprive it of those very features of positive, explicit, and manifest fidelity to Scripture and the settlements of the Reformation, which are requisite to secure the confidence of the public and the sufficiency and authority of the clergy, in the presence of the critical social condition more and more supervening in this country. Neither could the authorities of either of the Universities co-operate in such a design, without the intervention of precisely the same compromises; for if we eliminate the infidel element, prevailing certainly at Oxford, as recently expressly and deplorably testified by the Bishop of the diocese, the clerical rulers at the Universities are in much the same state of mind as the clergy at large. A divinity hall—a building such as the late Dr. Selwyn seems to have contemplated—may be provided: Professors—those existing, and others in addition—may be attached to such a hall; in character, they may be more or less Christian; in faith, more or less orthodox; and in the type, style, and quality of their lectures, they may be more or less attractive and valuable. But they can never be expected to supply an university class of students with the individual instruction requisite in such a science as Scriptural, practical, and experimental Christianity,—when he that is taught is to issue from the class thoroughly qualified and equipped himself to be a teacher. For proficiency in mathematics, the private tutor is required: an assistance which shall be equivalent or corresponding will be indispensable, if the institution which we contemplate is to be such as to supply the professional preparation demanded in clergymen at the present crisis in the Church, and in the approaching one perilous for Christianity, in all probability.

What it were vain to expect elsewhere at present, might, we venture to think, be attempted by the Evangelical party. They are united with regard to the principles of doctrine and worship. Upon the subjects to be taught they could thoroughly agree. Through the instrumentality of such as have their confidence

Digitized by Google

they could co-operate in the organization of a theological institution or institutions, in the appointment of teachers, and in the government and maintenance of what should be established. We believe that at present such an achievement is practicable, because at present the majority of those who hold the fundamental distinctions of Evangelical doctrines are united in sentiment, have confidence in each other, co-operate already in some projects, and might as readily and effectually unite in such an enterprise as this, if once effectually interested in it.

We must add that we mean by the Evangelical body, not an organization,—not even a combination, however loose,—but individuals contemplated as an imaginary selection. They comprise the members of the Church of England who hold the views of Scott the Commentator, of the Rev. Charles Simeon, of John Newton, of the Venns, of the philanthropist William Wilberforce, and of the Sumners (Archbishop and Bishop), with regard to dogmatic truth and experimental religion. So far as they act unitedly and exclusively, it is chiefly in organizations for the spread of sound Scriptural doctrine at home and abroad, such as the Church Missionary and Church Pastoral Aid Societies. Some, it may be, holding these views, have found their faith sufficiently asserted and taught by the formularies of the Church, and by its ordinary ministers, and have hitherto shrunk from the recognition of any combinations but such as are commended by ecclesiastical authorities. Now they may perceive the jeopardy to which that faith and the stability of the Church are exposed, and be moved to deviate from this practice, by the very loyalty to the Church which heretofore has constrained them to pursue it.

We do not suppose that an attempt, on the part of certain persons holding Evangelical sentiments, to establish a hall at either of the Universities, where theological instruction shall be systematically imparted, is likely to excite much hostile criticism, on the ground that as a party movement it is calculated to perfect, propagate, and perpetuate divisions in doctrine in the Church. Divisional efforts of this category are no longer uncommon. Divers Bishops of particular views have instituted and organized theological institutions, in which their views, no doubt, are inculcated. A College of some description, in commemoration of Bishop Thirlwall, is now said to be in contemplation, in which a fixed scheme of doctrinal teaching will have to be adopted, which is certain to excite criticism, on the ground of deficiency, redundancy, or obliquity. Besides, at Oxford a hall has been established, is in actual operation, and distinguished by marked success, which bears the name of Keble, the very prophet, as it were, of the Ritualistic party, where it is reasonable to

Digitized by Google

suppose his personal views and sentiments in religion are inculcated. In the presence of such a variety of divisional efforts to provide theological instruction, it is to us a matter of surprise that as yet no institution for the purpose should have emerged at Cambridge, in professed commemoration of the venerated Charles Simeon, and honoured with his name as its designation.

When the Church, as a body, fails to provide what by all is admitted to be requisite, we are not to be surprised if particular divisions of the Church proceed to act for themselves. We conceive that the episcopal originators of the theological institutions referred to, and the sympathizers with the late Mr. Keble, would not have hesitated to justify their respective attempts to provide for the inculcation and preservation of their particular views in religion, as measures of self-preservation. We shall be content with this plea. Whatever we attempt shall be done, as we hope, in the humble, gentle, and affectionate spirit of a child, which does what properly is the part of the Church, not in the temper and purpose of an usurper, but in pity and compassion, because she is unable to achieve it herself. Deferential we shall be in all respects to University and Ecclesiastical authorities, so far as may be consistent with a full and free development and execution of a system of theological teaching in accordance with Scripture, and with the Church of England's interpretation of Scripture. Most certainly the individuals of the imaginary selection designated by us, the Evangelical party, who may respond to our appeal and so far combine as to carry it out, will not move unitedly as a phalanx, presumptuous in deportment and aggressive in purpose. Rather will they co-operate with the inoffensive modesty and simplicity of birds of passage at the season of migration, which assemble at the bidding of a family instinct, and unite in the prosecution of their design for the purpose of self-preservation.

Self-preservation! Certainly. We contend that the existence of the Church, as a national institution, is in growing peril so long as the clergy shall remain unprovided, before their ordination, with adequate professional instruction. We are not prepared to affirm that were this provided the Church establishment would necessarily survive its existing perils, but we are more or less convinced that without some attempt at such a provision, its collapse is becoming every day more and more imminent. The English, no doubt, are a good-humoured race; they are very patient; but forbearance with them is ever, though slowly, verging to a crisis. We apprehend that at length their common-sense is beginning to be offended at the ignorance and helplessness of many of the clergy, now that the inevitable results manifest themselves so perfectly and so flagrantly, and put the self-respect

Digitized by Google

of the nation to shame. Elements seem to be in concoction sufficient to engender a more serious degree of discontent, and nothing is more portentous than the ill-humour of a good-humoured nation when once deeply and universally awakened. We do not say that what could be effected by the Evangelical section, through the establishment and maintenance of a theological institution, would amount to very much. Not a little, however, it would itself effect, and more still it might suggest. If anything were thus achieved for the preservation of the Establishment, the Evangelical section, identifying their own welfare with that of their Church and country, would certainly reckon its achievement an act of self-preservation.

With regard to one point our minds are made up. If members of the Evangelical section of the Church attempt to provide for the professional instruction of the clergy, the provision made should be worthy of the enterprise, and adequate to the occasion. Of course the exigences created through the prevalence of Ritualism, must be fully met. But Infidelity is also present. It exists, and is active, aggressive, and defiant, in the highest and lowest levels of intellect, learning, and social being. Thus while the external developments of Christianity are misrepresented, denaturalized, and caricatured by Ritualism, the facts and principles on which it is grounded, long received as admitted and indisputable traditions, are now called in question. What is more, the doctrinal contents of the New Testament have not as yet been thoroughly ransacked. The most essential, indeed, have been ascertained and defined with more or less accuracy, and adjusted in their mutual relations. But much, not entering into an elementary conception of the mode and means of salvation, is still in the quarry, or lying loosely and disattached, as once were the blocks of stone ready for the temple of Solomon, but for a while unplaced. To anything like a full, correct, and properly connected representation of what St. Paul taught, and a presentation of it in essential and obvious harmony with the respective inspirations of St. Peter, St. John, and St. James, these subordinate, and we may add, more difficult portions of the New Testament, are indispensable. Without them, the very doctrines on which the servants of God depend for their spiritual support and stability, are more or less fragmentary and one-sided. Their development is incomplete; the conceptions which are formed of them consequently are in many respects vague and uncertain. Wherefore doors are left open, and occasions given for the introduction of any interpretation of the unsettled departments of apostolic doctrine, however crude, and for the disturbances caused by the formation of a party accepting such interpretation, and crystallizing on it as a basis. To the

Digitized by Google

divisions which ensue, and to the consequent enfeeblement of the common spiritual life and action, the Evangelical body have been, and are still seriously exposed. Every symptom in the features and pulse of this era is favourable to the evolution and propagation of such divisions. Against them there is no instrumental protection, in addition to the invisible, spiritual, and providential protection of the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, but a patient, prayerful, and thorough investigation of the Scriptures, and an adjustment of their whole spiritual and moral contents, so far as these contents (which are themselves bestowed by God in such a form as to be at certain points essentially fragmentary) may admit. The distinctive features, then, of the enterprise which now solicits the attention, and craves the adoption and execution of members of the Evangelical section, in the interest at once of the Church Establishment, of the doctrine, extension, and unity of the Evangelical party themselves, and, in short, of Christianity in this country, is now more or less before us, and evident.

The requisite Institution (established, let us say, at Cambridge) should not be on an insignificant scale. It should not comprise material accommodation of small dimensions, nor teachers few in number, and of second-rate ability, attainment, reputation, and piety, with salaries secondary also in amount. Neither should the duration of the course of theological instruction be confined to a short period. Whatever is devised should be amply sufficient for the purpose in view, whatever may be the requisite cost and effort. That purpose ought to be the evolution, in a student of fair capacity, industry, and piety, of a fitness for the sacred ministry, in point of preparatory knowledge, worthy of a Church which, in the essentials of its doctrine, worship, and organization, is the most apostolic; and with regard to position and prestige, is calculated to be the most influential in Christendom. To produce an official worthy of such a position, at an era when Christianity is in mortal conflict, on one side for its purity, and on the other for its existence,—when the Church, the steward of its mysteries, is constrained by the necessity of its wants to elicit in itself what is still undeveloped, to define what is vague, to adjust what is loose, to reconcile what is contradictory, to illuminate what is obscure, and above all to simplify what is abstruse and confused, and invest it in a form so fitted for circulation, that if God will, the ministration of the Gospel may be once more, to every class, the manifest instrument of God's "power unto salvation,"—we say that for such a project efforts should be made, on a scale larger even than the most liberal estimate of the necessity may suggest, that the very abundance of the provision may testify to the descent of God's blessing, as

Digitized by Google

in the case of the temple devised by King David, and be at once a prognostic of its success, and a recommendation of its purpose.

We have neither time nor space to enter further, at present, on the details of the organization and functions of the proposed Institution. We cannot, however, but observe, ere we close, that it should be the part of the Body of Instructors, in their private capacity, to collect, centralise, criticise, and concoct the substantial results of the activity of inquiry, research, speculation, and reflection on the part of individuals, for which this era is so distinguished. They should *prove* all emerging from the press that is of a nature to be auxiliary to one whose office is to be that of a teacher and guide in religion, and rejecting what is false, fanciful, and irrelevant, hold fast that which is good. They should reduce it to its essence, and present it in such a form and manner to the young student that he may understand and digest it, and thus assimilate it to the body of moral, spiritual, and historical religious knowledge already accepted and taught. It is obvious that until that which is precious shall be separated from that which is base of the produce of modern activity in the fields of Christian research and criticism, and that which is retained shall be put in circulation by the modern teacher as occasion may suggest, the Church of God may be said to suffer loss. It is not benefited by the acquisition of a novelty which is good and wholesome, nor warned against the intrusion of a novelty which is bad and pernicious. Why, for example, should not that which is valuable in the writings of Mansel and Moseley on the subject of miracles, or that which is true and to the purpose in the papers of Dr. Lightfoot, now issuing in the *Contemporary Review*, in connection with the original formation and authorization of the Christian canon, be digested and reduced to a form simple and compact, such as might be deposited in the minds of the candidate for the ministry, to prove an equipment for his subsequent position as a defender as well as expounder of the faith? The Scriptures, and very much that is cognate, externally and internally, have, as all know, long been the subject of German inquiry and investigation, and of German criticism and reflection. Some of the results are of admitted value. Why should not those be ascertained, and shaped in such a form that they may be readily adjusted to pre-admitted truth, and presented to the student in divinity? Thus he would be kept abreast of sound Scriptural knowledge in its progressive advance towards perfection; thus he would become a public teacher eventually of the very New Testament stamp, capable of bringing out of his storehouse of information things new as well as old, to the preservation of his own mental and

Digitized by Google

spiritual vitality, and to his protection against the shame of a public exposure of his ignorance. Will an educated layman, who has a taste for Scriptural investigations, continue to realize the authority of a public instructor in the Church, who does not manifest a knowledge of his subject in advance of that of his audience, in quantity and quality? We have but to add, that should the teaching agency of the proposed theological institution adopt the course just suggested, they could not but elevate their position and official character in the esteem of those whose approbation and estimate determine the permanent opinion of the public in the long run. Were they, in addition, to discharge their ordinary function with efficiency and satisfaction, they would go far to establish an authoritative school of theology, based on the Scriptural principles of the Reformation interpreted in an Evangelical sense, and comprising in its doctrines all the results of modern learning, of recent investigation, of superior thought, and of Christian experience, which from time to time should be admitted to be trustworthy by accredited judges.

We have not adverted to the rules of composition and the art of preaching: of course such instructions would be provided. We concur, however, with Mr. Bright, in the conviction that a knowledge of what has to be taught, which is copious, accurate in detail, and well adjusted, with an earnest determination to be understood and effectual, are the proper qualifications of a preacher.

A CHARGE.

A Charge. By the Right Rev. H. A. Douglas, Bishop of Bombay. Second Edition. London: Gardner. 1875.

THE circumstances under which, as we understand, the recent Charge of the Bishop of Bombay has been delivered, necessitating as they do his return to his native land, are of that character that must command respectful sympathy from all men. It is therefore something very far from any spirit of hostile criticism which prompts us to animadvert upon it. In itself however it is a document of so much importance, and does so distinctly reflect the views and opinions of a class of Churchmen who have within comparatively a recent period interested themselves in Missionary work, that it seems a matter of plain duty to comment upon it, or rather to furnish our readers with some account of it. It will be for them to bring the statements made therein to the touchstone of God's Word, and to judge for themselves how far it would be in their

Digitized by Google

power to sympathize with and encourage Missionary operations carried on upon the principles suggested by the Bishop of Bombay. In the earlier and statistical part of his Charge, the Bishop mentions that during six years he has confirmed 1,700 persons, of whom one-third were natives. He has also ordained seven persons as Deacons, of whom four were natives. There does not, he adds, seem to be any immediate prospect of any great addition to these numbers. The amount contributed in the Bombay Presidency for Missionary objects is estimated at 32,500 rupees, of which 16,000 are raised on behalf of the Church Missionary Society.

We notice, with much satisfaction, the pre-eminence assigned by his Lordship to the "subject of Missions, which overshadows all others by its greatness, and holds our whole life as a Church bound up in itself." In this sentiment we cordially coincide. It may be thought that an utterance of this kind is merely a professional statement on the part of a ruler of the Church. However widely in many things we may differ from Bishop Douglas, we feel fully assured that in his case it is not a mere *façon de parler*, but a solemn and earnest conviction.

It is not, however, as yet an universal opinion even among our prelates. Only recently it was a subject of general remark that at the Missionary meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel the Archbishop of Canterbury alone represented the English Episcopate. It is still less the universal opinion of Englishmen either in India or at home. The strong conviction of some Englishmen entertains it, but the function of the large majority seems to sneer at and to depreciate missionary effort. If British Christians in the Bombay Presidency held the views of the Bishop of Bombay on the paramount importance of missions to the heathen his Lordship's statistics would tell a different tale. The Bishop then proceeds to dilate upon the work of the Church in its missionary capacity. In his observations there is much that is true, stated with considerable power and appropriateness. We might take exception to the assertion that "finding human nature corrupt, the Church changes, revives, and literally recreates it." Whatever may be his Lordship's definition of "the Church," we dispute this. It is true that immediately afterwards he says that Christ accomplishes this; and we think that it is much to be regretted that he should not have been content with this wholesome and scriptural doctrine. Further on his Lordship remarks: "Our Lord now lives on earth in His mystical body, and to be joined to that body is to be joined to Him, as to be joined to Him is to be joined to His body. That is to say it is our mission to make men partakers of the Divine nature, and in fulfilling that

Digitized by Google

mission we necessarily at the same time incorporate them in our divine society, of which they are the members and the incarnate Son of God the Head." Obviously the correctness of this turns upon the signification to be attached to "we" and "our;" also to what is to be understood by the "mystical body" of Christ. We will presume his Lordship to mean the visible Church of Christ, which, as defined by the Articles of the Church of which his Lordship is a prelate, "is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same." Assuming this to be the case, Christians generally will be in accordance with him; though it can only be in a very subordinate sense that man can make his fellow-man a partaker of the Divine nature. The Bishop then passes on to the question, How do we carry and impart this gift? The gift is, we presume, what is stated (p. 9)—the "giving to man a new human nature through participation in the Divine nature of Jesus Christ." His explanation is, first, by preaching the Gospel. But he goes on to say (p. 12) that great as this is "it is not everything, and when the intelligence of man has been informed and the heart kindled by the fire of truth, *nature* is not changed yet. According to the Bishop, when "we have brought a man to our Lord's feet, and he has exclaimed, 'Lord, I believe!' as yet he has not the Son, and therefore in any strict and proper sense of the term he has not life." Unless he has life, he must be dead. We have heard of dead professors of religion; unfortunately they abound, although multitudes of them have been baptized, and may be communicants, for to be "carnally minded is death;" and if Bishop Douglas himself were to sit in judgment upon them, he would pronounce them to be "carnally minded." He would say of multitudes of such persons whom he habitually meets in society that they "live in pleasure," and again that they "love not their brethren." But a dead believer at the feet of Jesus crying out to Him, "Lord, I believe!" and yet having no life, is a singular spectacle. We are tempted to ask, Were those Gentiles (Acts x. 44, 45), upon whom was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost after they had heard the Word of God, quickened by the Holy Spirit or not? It is true that their case presented a difficulty at the time, and caused much bewilderment to them of the circumcision. Perhaps if it had been an occurrence of our own days it might have caused considerable astonishment to those who share the opinions of Bishop Douglas. If it had not been for the unmistakable statements recorded, probably in the judgment of some Peter should have said, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, in order that they may

Digitized by Google

receive the Holy Ghost as well as we?" There may, however, in the opinion of those who hold with Bishop Douglas, be an impartation of the Holy Spirit of God by which men are not born again, which does not communicate to them a new nature, but which, although it so far influences them as to induce them to make most sincere and genuine profession of their belief in the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour, still leaves them unregenerate. This, to our apprehension, seems a singular paradox, but we do not see what other escape there can be from the dilemma. As a curious specimen of the Bishop's theology, we subjoin the following remarkable passage:—

"The law, as is shown in the Epistle to the Hebrews, was a thing of shadows and pictures. It was full of signs of grace but not of grace itself. It was a figurative system by which men were led to God by the hope of that which was to come, when figures would be superseded by realities, and was thus imperfect and only preparatory to better things hereafter to be revealed. 'The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.' But when our Lord appeared saying, 'Lo, I come to do Thy will,' all shadows departed, the sun rising to the meridian, and God Himself, the essence of reality, appearing in fulness of light among men, and from that day such a thing as an empty sign has been unknown in the ordinances of the Church of God. Mere figures from that moment vanished, and signs carried in themselves the substantial grace and life which our Lord conveyed, by means of them, to men. All relics of Judaism have disappeared. There is no veil in the Christian temple. Our Lord Himself is the 'new and living way' into an open heaven; and thus, as we preach a Gospel of facts, so correspondingly, we administer ordinances which are realities."

It may seem a remarkable statement, from the lips of a theologian of the school of Bishop Douglas, that "all relics of Judaism have disappeared" from Christianity. We have often seen Judaism much insisted upon and quoted as authority for many rites and practices which spiritual Christianity could, in our judgment, have most perfectly dispensed with. We do not know how far Bishop Douglas may sympathize with Ritualistic practices; but those who do uphold them would find themselves in a sorry plight, unless they had so much warrant as they can produce out of the Old Testament. We might take, for instance, the question of incense. Was that a figure under the Old Testament? Is it a reality under the new? and if so, what is that reality? What substantial grace and life is conveyed by it? Perhaps, however, and we hope it is the case, the Bishop looks upon incense as a puerility and a corrupt following of Judaizing practices, which ought to be obsolete. We fear, how-

Digitized by Google

ever, that in the present day at any rate more than one "empty sign" is not "unknown in the ordinances of the Church of God." Much, however, as we might feel disposed to discuss the confusing statements of the Bishop, we are constrained to pass on. Of Confirmation we are told that St. Paul spoke of it as "the sealing of the Spirit; and that St. John described it as "the unction from the Holy One!" Bishop Douglas adds, that "it is also the ordination of the laity to such priestly functions in worship and sacrifice, as all Christians are called to discharge." Nothing could be further from our wish and intention than in the slightest degree to disparage the value of confirmation as an apostolic rite and wholesome practice; but if the statements of Bishop Douglas convey any definite meaning, it would seem to follow that no layman, unless he has been confirmed, has any authority to conduct family worship in his own household; or, perhaps, if we were to press the statement still more closely, even to join and take part in the public worship of God. We suppose it might be lawful for him to pray in secret, and that God might hear his prayers. When such are the views of Bishop Douglas regarding baptism and confirmation, it would be plainly superfluous to discuss his views about the Lord's Supper. In the Bishop's Charge "the office of the ministry, as might be expected, is magnified," and "co-operation with persons of other communions" is to be deprecated. After passing an encomium upon "Dr. John Wilson," whom he highly honours for his work's sake,—but what that work can be upon the Bishop's theory we can hardly understand,—his lordship goes on to state that Dr. John Wilson, and others similarly situated, possess "zeal and other graces," and that there is "the manifest work of God's Spirit in them." Under some circumstances, too, it may be permitted to "meet them and confer with them."

It is, however, in the paragraph which is headed "Education as a Missionary Agency," that in our judgment the most serious danger lurks. It is so important, not as a mere impression of Bishop Douglas' own opinions, which might, especially under the peculiar circumstances of the case, be passed over in respectful silence, but as involving, if we rightly understand him, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in the preparation of books which should meet the Bishop's views, that we deem it a duty to place it before our readers in *extenso*.

"The common system may be thus described. Unbelievers are invited to a school, and in addition to a general education receive in it instruction in the Christian faith. The Word of God is put into their hands. Not only its biographies and history and morals are set before them, but some of the chief mysteries of our religion are expounded to unbelieving minds. . . . . Our

Digitized by Google

Lord, especially in His parables, which are characteristic of His system as a Prophet, taught men as they could bear it. To men whose intelligence was clouded by sin He showed truth in a cloud, veiling it, yet with a veil so slight that if there was but a will to lift up the curtain they would see the truth itself. His object was to reach the mind through the moral sense and through the heart. If there was a desire to know the truth, He met that desire; and as the desire grew His revelation of Himself became clearer and clearer. If the desire was wanting, having tested it, He withdrew His revelations, putting back into its sheath that sword of the Spirit which is a discerner of men's hearts. There was in Him no attempt to force, no bringing of souls which were unthirsty to the fountain, and compelling them to drink of the waters of life; but where there was a thirst, He satisfied it, and as the thirst grew, He quenched it more and ever more. Is this what we are doing? It seems to me that we are not. We seem rather to think that we can make men Christians without their will, and that if we make them Christians in knowledge, we shall make them also, at least in some cases, Christians in heart. Labour of this sort has been, and, I fear, will continue to be labour in vain. Yet, I do not say that no efforts should be made to leaven India, now growing in intelligence, with such truth as may help in due time to bring her people to our Lord's feet. I do but ask that we should recognise the actual condition of the people, and that, content with what is possible, we should (1) teach that natural religion which they are able to receive; and (2) give such veiled parabolic intimations of the Christian mysteries as may both create a thirst for more knowledge, and in part, where thirst arises, quench it. But there should be no casting of pearls before those who cannot discern their value. Mysteries are revealed only to the meek and childlike, and it is neither wise nor right to throw them down before souls which are still hard and sensualised, who will but learn to treat them with the contempt that familiarity engenders, or even growing in hardness to trample them in blind scorn beneath their feet. Certainly, the question of missionary schools is one demanding our most serious consideration, and as I know that many of our missionaries are doubtful of their usefulness, so also I believe that a reform is needed in the methods by which their end is sought. On this subject I may add that when in England I called the attention of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to the need which existed for an educational series suited to the unbelievers of India who attend our mission schools, and that steps were taken which should result in an issue of such a set of books. Bishop Claughton, Dr. Hessey, General Tremenheere, Mr. Bullock, and others, who assembled to discuss the matter, concurred in the principles on which it should be constructed, and we shall be provided, I hope, at no very distant period, through the Society, which is anxious to assist us, with this important aid to the performance of this branch of our missionary work."

We hope that calling attention to this astonishing statement,

Digitized by Google

may stir up some distinct inquiry as to whether the venerable Society is about to construct for India a series of educational works which shall "(1) teach that natural religion which the 'heathen' are able to receive, and (2) give such veiled parabolic intimations of the Christian mysteries as may both create a thirst for more knowledge, and in part, where thirst arises, quench it." It is with no feeling of disrespect to the Bishop that we hesitate to believe that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is undertaking so singular a task, and that we await further confirmation of it from other sources than the Bishop, with whom the wish may be father to the thought. We will hope, meanwhile, that he has misunderstood the distinguished persons that he has mentioned, or that they have misunderstood him, and that the result will be some useful school books, like those in circulation at home, with some marked adaptation to the taste and intelligence of the people of India, and that out of them unbelievers will receive "instruction in the Christian faith." We are hardly prepared for the maintenance in India of schools using books not much elevated above those found in what have been stigmatized as "godless" schools, so gradual may be the development of Christian mysteries in them. However, it may be best to wait till the new educational series of books, which the Bishop is so speedily anticipating may be issued. We presume that it is still intended that the Scriptures should be taught in the schools where these new publications will find admission, notwithstanding that in the New Testament Christ is revealed, not hidden; if so, perhaps, after all there may be no necessity for them. We would like, however, to be certified of this. Our remarks have extended to such a length that we cannot dwell upon the Bishop's views regarding evening communions, the eastward position, vestments, confession, and absolution: there is the less occasion for doing so, as these topics are so perpetually discussed at home that it may suffice to say that there is nothing novel in his Lordship's remarks, nor indeed of much importance. As a Bishop, he thinks the Church owes the Ritualists a good deal. From this we venture to differ.

As far as possible we have endeavoured to allow Bishop Douglas to speak for himself, interspersing only such comment as seemed absolutely necessary. If his Charge had been merely the utterance of an individual we should hardly have undertaken to notice it, but it is plainly caught up as a manifesto by a zealous party who would fain impregnate, if they could, evangelical men with their principles of missionary action. Strenuous efforts are being used to familiarize them gradually with these crotchets, and it is a plain duty to warn against them. We most earnestly deprecate the extension of a sacerdotal and

Digitized by Google

ritualistic system, with its mystic adumbrations of the truth and arrogant exclusiveness, to the mission field. All this makes havoc enough at home, where at any rate there is comparative familiarity with the Bible, and where, if priests would seek to remove the Lord Jesus Christ out of the ken of professing Christians, it is difficult to do so. But it would be simply fatal if a system of this description is to prevail in the missionary work. Rome has tried it to the uttermost, and we believe dispite all the empty bragging which abounds, it has been, so far as spiritual results are concerned, an ignominous failure. We wish no feeble copy, no poor parody of it to be attempted in our missions. It is in the outspoken utterance of these dangerous delusions, for such we deem them, that must be discovered the jealousy and misgiving which we entertain for any fellowship or participation with those who advocate them, even though members of our own Church, while our sympathy is sincere for those who, although, as Bishop Douglas would phrase it, they have not the same "organism and corporate life" as ours, yet preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified, openly, freely, fully, in season and out of season, making no mystery of that which God has revealed for the salvation of all men. To the uttermost we have striven not to do the Bishop's views injustice, but they may so often be interpreted in a double sense; there is so often an esoteric meaning as well as an exoteric attaching to them, according as they are interpreted by those who read them, that we may occasionally have fallen into mistakes. If so we would seek even beforehand to apologize, for it has been with much reluctance that we have ventured to criticise when it has been so difficult to separate the individual from the official. With the one our sympathy is sincere and profound; with the other, as the representative of opinions in our judgment most dangerous, we have striven earnestly, yet we trust respectfully, to differ, most widely, and with most distinct and marked emphasis. Whatever else may be Romanized amongst us we trust our Missions may be spared. It is for this reason that we call attention to the efforts made in this direction, whether consciously or unconsciously, to the ruin of infant Churches, and to the obscuration of Christ from the souls of the perishing heathen.

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. IV.

(1) *Sacrificial Feasts.*

THE words "sacrifice" and "offering" are so identified in ordinary language, that the clear distinctions between them to be found in the original Scriptures are not generally observed. The conse-

Digitized by Google

quences of this confusion are by no means unimportant, and cannot be obviated without much careful study. The sacrifices proper were sacred feasts, in which, by the performance of certain rites, the participators were brought into communion with God. While the ascending-offerings were wholly turned to vapour, to signify the sinner's complete acceptance through atonement; and the sin-offerings were consumed outside the camp, or else eaten by the priest, to signify the doing away of sin; the ordinary *sacrifices*, properly so called, were eaten by the offerer, his family and friends, the Levite, widow and fatherless, being frequently invited also to have a share in the festivity. The blood of these sacrifices was sprinkled on the altar, the fat and liver were also burnt or vaporised there, and a certain part of the flesh was put aside for the priest; but the rest was eaten by the people, to set forth their communion or oneness with God, whose food they shared on these occasions. A clear apprehension of this fact is essential to the right understanding of numerous passages, both in the Old and New Testament; and yet numbers of Bible-readers seem to labour under the mistaken idea that all the sacrifices were entirely burnt on the altar.

Some general instructions on this subject are to be found in the twelfth of Deuteronomy. Thus we read in the fifteenth and following verses, "Thou mayest kill (literally, sacrifice) and eat flesh within all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which He hath given thee: the unclean and the clean may eat thereof, as of the roebuck, and as of the hart. Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it upon the earth as water. But thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thy oil, or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flock, nor any of thy vows which thou vowest, nor thy freewill offerings, or heave-offering of thine hand: thou must eat *them* before the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates: and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God in all that thou puttest thine hands unto..... When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as He hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh, ... thou mayest eat flesh, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after..... Only thy holy things which thou hast, and thy vows, thou shalt take, and go unto the place which the Lord shall choose: and thou shalt offer thine ascending-offerings, both the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of the Lord thy God: and the blood of thy sacrifices (or sacrificial feasts) shall be poured out upon the altar of the Lord thy God, *and thou shalt eat the flesh.*" (See also Deut. xvi. 11; Prov. vii. 14.)

Digitized by Google

Thus a distinction was drawn between the ordinary meals in which animal food might be partaken at home, and the special, sacred, or sacrificial meals which were to be eaten before the Lord in the precincts of the house of God, which was on this account called the house of sacrifice. (2 Chron vii. 12.)

The titles given to these feasts show their nature, and indicate the various motives which prompted the worshipper to celebrate them. They are frequently called peace-offerings; or, as the word might better be rendered, recompense-offerings. They were something *rendered* or *recompensed* to the Lord in consequence of His goodness. Others are called vows: *i.e.*, votive offerings, because they had been promised in a time of trouble, and were afterwards to be paid. Others were called free-will offerings. These had not been promised beforehand, but were offered spontaneously in gratitude to God for some signal mercy. They are also described as thank-offerings, because they were made in thankful acknowledgment of His mercy. In all cases the leading characteristic in the heart of the offerer was thankfulness; and this feeling, which showed itself in sacred festivities, was usually connected with some historical event, national, domestic, or personal, calling forth some token of gratitude towards the Most High.

The animal offered on these occasions was to be unblemished, but it might be either a male or a female. The offerer having pressed his hands on its head, to identify himself with it, was to kill it; and then the priest was to sprinkle its blood on the altar, and burn the fat, together with the kidneys and the lobe above the liver, "the efflorescence of animal life." This small portion, as a representative of the whole animal (and consequently of the offerer), was to arise to God in sweet vapour, and so to be fed upon by Him. (Lev. ii. 9.) The breast and the shoulder were to be given to the priest who conducted the ministrations, the one being waved to and fro, and the other heaved or lifted up and down, and both being presented by the offerer with his own hands. The rest was eaten by the offerer, his family, and friends, together with particular cakes and biscuits, and with leavened bread. All the flesh was to be eaten on the same day, if it was a thanksgiving feast; but if a votive, or free-will feast, the remainder might be eaten the second day, and anything which remained over was to be destroyed by burning. This order was given both so as to ensure a liberal distribution of the food through the household and dependents, and also to provide against the possibility that the feast might lose its religious significance by being spread over too long a period. None were to partake of it unless they were free from ceremonial uncleanness. These and other particulars are to be found in the seventh of Leviticus, the eleventh and following verses.

Digitized by Google

(2) *Instances of Sacrificial Feasts in the Old Testament.*

Several instances of sacrificial feasts are mentioned in the Old Testament. Thus they were held on the occasion of the ark being restored to the land of Israel, for it is stated that the men not only offered burnt-offerings, but also "sacrificed sacrifices:" *i.e.*, kept a sacrificial feast. (1 Sam. vi. 15.) The same was the case when David brought the ark to Mount Zion (2 Sam. vi. 13—17), on which occasion he "dealt among all the people, as well to the women as men, to every one a cake of bread, and a good piece (of flesh), and a flagon (of wine)." Moreover, "he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Hosts." (1 Chron. xvi. 3.) Another case is to be found in 1 Sam. ix. 12, etc. Saul and his servant were told that there was a sacrificial feast in the high place, and that the people would not eat till Samuel came, because he blessed the sacrifice, "and afterwards they eat that be bidden." About thirty guests were invited, and were assembled in what is described as "the parlour," and a special part (the shoulder) was reserved, by Samuel's order, for Saul. A few years later, when Saul and the people spared the best of the sheep and oxen of the Amalekites, it was professedly for the purpose of a sacrificial feast; but Samuel reminded Saul that God had not so much pleasure in the fat burnt in His house on such occasions, as in obedience. (1 Sam. xv. 15, 22.)

As the anointing of Saul took place in connection with a sacrificial feast, so did the anointing of David. All Jesse's sons had to sanctify themselves, or make themselves ceremonially clean on the occasion; and Samuel would not sit down to the meal until the youngest son was present. (1 Sam. xvi. 4—11.)

The dedication of the temple was a time for much sacrificial feasting, together with the presentation of ascending-offerings. Numberless sheep and oxen were slain and eaten. (1 Kings viii. 63—65.) The cleansing of the temple in the days of Manasseh was accompanied with similar feasts. (2 Chron. xxxiii. 16.)

Another instance will be found in the history of Elkanah (1 Sam. i. 24), where the feast consisted of three bullocks, an ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine. (Com. 1 Sam. x. 3, where men are described as going to the house of God with three kids, three loaves, and a bottle of wine.) Votive-offerings and feasts were also offered by the sailors, and by Jonah himself. (Jonah i. 16; ii. 9.)

Although King Jeroboam did what he could to sever the religious connection between Israel and Judah, by ordaining a sacrificial system at Bethel and Dan, and devising a special festival "out of his own heart" (1 Kings xii. 32), yet in the later days of Israel, godly members of the ten tribes occasionally united with the other two in keeping sacred feasts at Jerusalem. (See for example 2 Chron. xi. 16.)

Digitized by Google

In the fifteenth year of the reign of Asa, in the third month, we are told that the King "gathered all Judah and Benjamin, and the strangers with them out of Ephraim and Manasseh, and out of Simeon: for they fell to him out of Israel in abundance when they saw that the Lord his God was with him..... And they held a sacrificial feast before the Lord at that time of the spoil which they had brought, seven hundred oxen and seven thousand sheep. And they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul." (2 Chron xv. 9—12.)

Votive-offerings, thank-offerings, and recompense or peace-offerings, are also referred to in the Psalms. Thus in Ps. lxvi. 13, 14, we read: "I will pay (or recompense) Thee my vows which my lips uttered, and my mouth spoke when I was in trouble." Again, in Ps. lxxvi. 11, the Psalmist writes: "Vow, and pay (or recompense) unto the Lord;" and in Ps. cvii. 22, when referring to the praise due to God after deliverance from shipwreck, he adds: "Let them sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving, and declare His works with singing." And once more, having raised the question in Ps. cxvi. 12, "What shall I render (or recompense) unto the Lord for all His benefits towards me?" he answers, "I will pay my vows unto the Lord now, in the presence of all His people..... I will offer to Thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and will call upon the name of the Lord."

(3) *Idolatrous Feasts.*

As the object of the sacrificial feast was to enter into communion with God through joint partaking of the same food, it would follow that at an idolatrous feast men would become partakers with false gods, whether we regard these objects of worship as mere images of wood and stone representing the powers of nature, or whether we regard them as demons or evil spirits. St. Paul tells us that those who partook of the remains of an idolatrous feast, if they did so "with conscience of the idol,"—*i.e.*, with a feeling that they were thus brought into some sort of communion with a false god,—were defiled thereby; much more were those defiled who deliberately pledged themselves to idolatry by partaking of these feasts.

Solomon was guilty of this practice, see 1 Kings xi. 8, and others of the Kings followed his example. After the return of some of the ten tribes from Assyria, the same sinful course was pursued. (2 Kings xvii. 32.) In Is. lxv. 4, we read of those who "remain among the graves and lodge in the monuments (as if seeking to hold communion with the dead), who eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels." The word here rendered "broth," but rendered "pieces" in the

Digitized by Google

margin, is also used in Judges vi. 19, 20, where we read as follows: "Gideon made ready a kid, and unleavened cakes of an ephah of flour: the flesh he put in a basket, and he put the broth in a pot..... And the angel of God said, Take the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and lay (them) upon this rock, and pour out the broth." Probably what is here described as broth consisted of the cakes or biscuits which were brought in the pot or pan in which they had been baked. (Compare Num. xi. 8, where the same Hebrew word is used for the pan in which the manna was baked.) Whether this be so or not, it is evident that the passage in Isaiah refers to a sacrificial eating of an abominable and idolatrous character. The same is the case where we read, in the eleventh verse of the same chapter, of those "who prepare a table for Gad (or Chance), and who furnish a drink-offering for Meni (or the Moon). So we read in Jer. vii. 18, of those who "knead dough to make cakes to the Queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods."

(4) *The Passover.*

This venerable festival existed before the establishment of the Levitical priesthood or the Mosaic law, and has continued to be celebrated amongst the ancient people long after their altars have ceased to smoke. It was the most national of all the feasts, being specially commemorative of the redemption of the people from Egypt.

It is unnecessary here to enter into the reason and origin of the ordinance, which Moses kept (literally, did) by faith (Heb. xi. 28), at a time when the lintel and side-posts of each man's house took the place of the altar; when every head of the household had to sprinkle the blood, without the intervention of a priest; and when the eating of the unleavened bread was simply a matter of necessity, owing to the circumstances of that "night much to be remembered." Our business now is rather to consider the ordinance as it was afterwards appointed to be kept, from generation to generation.

On the fourteenth day of the first month, the paschal victim (which might be a lamb, kid, or bullock) was to be slain, except under particular circumstances, when it was to be postponed until the following month. The head of each household took the lamb, which had been selected for this purpose four days previously, to the sacred enclosure; there he slew it, and the priests sprinkled the blood and burnt the fat, etc., as was done in the case of all other sacrificial feasts. This was to be done in the afternoon, or "between the two evenings;" that is to say, at or about the time of the offering up of the evening

Digitized by Google

ascending-offerings.[a] The offerer then took the flesh of the lamb back to his family, who were gathered in the immediate neighbourhood of the sanctuary, and there they would all eat it together, with the proper accompaniments and in the appointed way. These particulars are clearly set down in the ninth of Numbers, and in other passages.

The main difficulty with regard to the Passover is to ascertain the distinction as to time between the slaughter of the paschal lamb, and the celebration of the feast of unleavened bread. This difficulty arises from the fact that the Jewish days began not at sunrise, but at sunset. In Lev. xxiii. 5, etc., we read: "In the fourteenth day of the first month, between the evenings, is the Passover to the Lord." By this we are to understand that towards the close of the fourteenth of Nisan, the paschal lamb or kid was to be slain. "And on the fifteenth of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread to the Lord." This feast then would begin after the sunset of the fourteenth of Nisan, a few hours after the slaying of the paschal victim. "Seven days ye must eat unleavened bread." Thus the feast of unleavened bread lasted up to the sunset of the twenty-first of Nisan. Similarly in Num. xxviii. 16, etc., we read: "In the fourteenth day of the first month is the Passover to the Lord. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten." Again, in Josh. v. 10—12, we are told that "the children of Israel encamped in Gilgal, and kept the Passover on the fourteenth day of the month at even in the plains of Jericho. And they did eat of the old corn (or produce) of the land on the morrow after the Passover (that is to say, just after the sunset of the fourteenth), unleavened cakes, and parched corn in the selfsame day. And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn (or produce) of the land."

Thus the lamb was to be slain in the afternoon, and to be eaten the same evening or night, after the fifteenth day of Nisan, or the first day of unleavened bread had begun.

There were special sacrifices for each day of the week of unleavened bread: namely, two bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs, with their meat-offerings, and also a goat for a sin-offering.

(5) *Later References to the Passover.*

There are several references to the Passover in the later Books. It is generally supposed that this was the "yearly feast" described

[a] The time is definitely stated in Deut. xvi. 6, as "at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth from Egypt." The time of the departure from Egypt appears to have been midnight, and this fact was to be commemorated by the *comparative* lateness of the paschal rite. It was to be an evening sacrifice, not a morning one; a supper, not a mid-day meal.

Digitized by Google

in Judg. xxi. 19, and which is again referred to in 1 Sam. i. 3, as taking place in Shiloh.

The thirtieth chapter of the second Book of Chronicles contains a graphic account of the paschal feast as it was kept in Hezekiah's reign. He wrote letters to all Israel, as well as Judah, urging them to keep the Passover unto the Lord God of Israel. It was held in the second month instead of the first, according to the permission given in Num. ix. 10, 11, because the priests had not had time to sanctify themselves. Nothing could be more affecting than the earnestness of the exhortation which the King sent throughout the whole land, urging all Israel to turn to the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; and although the messengers were received with scorn, yet "divers of Asher and Manasseh and of Zebulon (and also of Issachar) humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem." Many of the people who came up had not sanctified themselves; consequently the Levites slew the paschal lambs for every one that was not clean, and Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, "The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, even though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary." Not content with keeping the feast of unleavened bread seven days, "the people took counsel to keep other seven days," and during the whole fortnight the Princes provided an abundance of peace-offerings for the sacrificial feasts. And the priests and Levites praised the Lord day by day, singing with loud instruments unto the Lord. And they blessed the people, and their voice was heard, and their prayer came up to His holy dwelling-place, even unto heaven.

The Passover held in Josiah's time was one of peculiar interest: "Surely there was not holden such a Passover from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor of the Kings of Judah." (2 Kings xxiii. 22.) We are told that he offered for the people, of the flock, lambs and kids, for the Passover-offerings, for all that were present, to the number of 30,000, and 3,000 bullocks. The Princes also gave freely. The Levites appear to have killed the offerings on that occasion, and the priests sprinkled the blood. "They roasted the Passover with fire, according to the ordinance: but the other holy offerings sod they in pots, and in caldrons, and in pans, and divided them speedily among all the people. And afterward they made ready for themselves, and for the priests: because the priests the sons of Aaron were busied in offering of burnt-offerings and the fat until night." (2 Chron. xxxv. 7—14.)

In the account of the Passover mentioned in Ezra vi. 19—22, it is noticed that the priests and Levites, being pure, killed the paschal lamb for all the children of the captivity, as well as for

Digitized by Google

themselves. "And the children of Israel, which were come again out of captivity, and all such as had separated themselves unto them from the filthiness of the heathen of the land, to seek the Lord God of Israel, did eat. And they kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy."

(6) *The Connection of Sacrifices with Covenants.*

"A testament," says the Apostle, writing to the Hebrews, "is of force after men are dead." (Chap. ix. 17.) This passage might otherwise be rendered thus: "A covenant is ratified over dead bodies." Whether this translation be accepted or not, the fact remains that according to Patriarchal and Mosaic custom, certain covenants were sealed or rendered valid by the blood of slain victims.

The joint eating of food has been a bond of union in almost all countries, and from the earliest ages; and when animal food was partaken of, the giving up of the life of the victim was necessitated, and in some cases the blood of the slain was so dealt with as to become "the blood of the covenant."

The covenant between God and the family of Noah was established in immediate connection with burnt-offerings. (See Gen. viii. 20; ix. 16.) The Abrahamic covenant, of which we have an account in the fifteenth of Genesis, is deeply interesting. Here the assurance was given to Abram that he should inherit the land, and a remarkable sign was vouchsafed. A heifer, a she-goat, a ram, a turtle-dove, and a pigeon (the principal victims offered in later days), were slain, and arranged, probably, on an altar or mound of earth. Abram remained near them, and drove off the birds of prey hour after hour, until God's appointed time, which was, as so often, towards sunset. Then came the vision and the revelation. And it came to pass, that when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace and a lamp of fire that passed between the halves or portions into which the victims were divided. A similar thing seems to have happened in the case of the covenant made by the Jews many years later, for we read in Jer. xxxiv. 19, "I will give (into the hand of their enemies) the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before Me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof, even the Princes of Judah, and the Princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, and the priests, and all the people of the land, which passed between the parts of the calf." The reference here seems to be to such a covenant as is mentioned in 2 Kings xxiii. 3, where we are told that King Josiah "made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep His commandments and His testimonies and His statutes with all their heart and all their soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in

Digitized by Google

this book (of the law): *and all the people stood to the covenant.*" (Compare also Neh. x. 29, etc., and the expression in Ps. l. 5: "Those that have made a covenant with Me by sacrifice.")

There is a singular connection between eating and blessing in the case of Isaac's blessing his sons before he died, and many writers see in this history some traces of a covenant feast. When Laban and Jacob made a covenant with one another, they ordered stones to be gathered together in a heap, "and they did eat there upon the heap." "Then," proceeds the history, "Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread: and they did eat bread, and tarried all night in the mount." The narrative of Jethro's visit to the camp of Israel, furnishes us with another instance of a covenant ratified by sacrifice, for we are told that "he took a burnt-offering, and also sacrifices (*i.e.*, communion feasts) for God; and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God." (Ex. xviii. 12.)

At the time of the giving of the law, Moses appointed certain young men to offer burnt-offerings, and to prepare peace-offerings, or communion-feasts of oxen for the Lord, the altar having been built with twelve pillars, to represent the twelve tribes. Half the blood of these offerings was sprinkled by Moses, acting as God's priest, on the altar, and the other half on the people. (Ex. xxiv. 5, 6.) The book of the covenant was also sprinkled with the blood. (Heb. ix. 19—21.)

It may be observed, before quitting this part of the subject, that the Scriptural idea of a covenant, as illustrated by many of these passages, involves the death of a mediating victim, whose flesh is partaken of by both parties, or whose blood is represented as sprinkled over both. Thus the two covenanting parties are united in the one victim. As the pressure of the hands on the head of a sacrificial animal caused it to be regarded as the offerer's representative, so the passing between the halves of a body whose blood had been sprinkled on the altar, would signify that the two parties to a covenant, man and God, were firmly united. They were made one *in the victim*, and were solemnly pledged to perform that which they had promised. Such a covenant was not a mere compact: it was a διαθηκη, not a συνθηκη. Its validity depended on the bloodshedding of a victim; and it was doubtless this peculiarity which caused the Latin translators, and afterwards the authors of our own version, to render it by the word *Testament*. The occasional use of this term is unfortunate and inconvenient, for it tends to hinder understanding of that relationship which exists between man and God in Christ crucified, and which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews expounds by reference to the Mosaic covenant.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. A New Translation, on the basis of the Authorized Version, from a critically revised Greek Text, newly arranged in Paragraphs, with Analysis, copious References and Illustrations from Original Authorities, New Chronological and Analytical Harmony of the Four Gospels, Notes and Dissertations. A Contribution to Christian Evidence. By John Brown McClellan, M.A., Vicar of Bottisham, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. I. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan and Co. 1875.

EVERY scholarly and painstaking contribution to the criticism and exegesis of the inspired Word, if calmly executed and modestly presented, is entitled to a kindly welcome, and to careful and candid consideration. In the case of the work now before us, there is no question that it is the production of a scholar, and of a most diligent and laborious student. It exhibits no little research, and in many parts acuteness and ingenuity, together with (especially in some of the dissertations) a considerable power of grappling with difficult and complicated questions. We should therefore have been prepared, though dissenting strongly from many of Mr. McClellan's principles and conclusions, to have given his book a much more cordial reception, had it not been pervaded by a tone of assumption and self-sufficiency much to be regretted. Over-weening self-confidence, harsh and unseemly language concerning those who differ from him, to a most irritating degree characterize the work. In his animadversions upon men of opposite views to his own, Mr. McClellan painfully reminds us of the ferocity which formerly was conspicuous in the rude encounters of classical scholars, when battling over corrupt texts in Greek plays. How much out of place a spirit of this kind is in a commentary on the New Testament, it is needless for us to say. At the outset we are offended by an obtrusive and pompous use of the "we," "us," "our's," "ourselves," in reference to the Editor himself. This may be but a trifle, but it is so interwoven with dogmatism, both in the style and matter, as almost to compel one to regard it as characteristic of the mind of the writer.

On the other hand, with reference to such men as Professors Lightfoot, and Westcott, and others, he does not hesitate to assert that they are committed to theories and designs respecting the original text, "which full research and solid reason constrain us emphatically to condemn, and grievously deplore."

It would be easy to multiply specimens of a style of writing, complacent as to himself, contemptuous as to others, which Mr. McClellan thinks fit to adopt; but it would be a very

Digitized by Google

invidious task. We feel, however, bound to remark that it is a style painfully unbecoming in itself, and sadly prejudicial to the cause he desires to serve.

While, however, at the outset it is needful to enter a protest in regard to the tone and style of this book, it does contain a great deal of valuable matter, and presents discussions of difficult points well worth attentive consideration. The plan and purpose of Mr. McClellan's book is stated as follows, by himself:—

"Our object in the present work, the continued labour, so far, of more than fifteen years, has been to offer, as a contribution to the evidences of apostolic Christianity, such an exhibition and examination of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, as by its clearness and completeness shall plainly convict and shame the false assertions and fallacious arguments of scepticism, and confirm or, where need be, restore the ancient confidence of sober-minded and reasonable men in the infallible truth of the Gospels and the rest of the Scriptures. This object rests upon the firm conviction that the intelligent reading of the New Testament itself is the surest preservative against the sophistries of unbelief, and discloses irresistible confirmation of the Christian dogma. To this end, therefore (we speak of our endeavour rather than our performance), we have proposed, as here shall be stated in brief and more largely unfolded hereafter,—First, to construct (for the sure hidden foundation), from all the rich and now sufficiently accumulated stores of original evidence, a pure original Greek text of these Scriptures,—that is to say, a text which shall be the nearest possible approximation, in the original tongue, to the very words in which they were delivered at the first, by the inspired writers, to the Churches. Second, from this Greek text, upon the basis of our endeared and venerable Authorized Version (after such an exhaustive investigation of the original language as has now for the first time, we believe, been attempted for the purpose of any version), to produce a most faithful and exact English translation, which, while never departing to any unnecessary extent from the style and diction now happily familiar to the Church, shall yet satisfy the most rigid demands of sound and accurate scholarship. Third, to exhibit to the eye of the reader, for his ready use and thorough satisfaction, ample authorities for the words and phrases of the translation, as likewise for the sense and allusions, from all the original authorities, and from such only. Fourth, to examine and refute at length all the principal particular charges of inconsistency and discrepancy alleged by the sceptics against the contents of the Holy Gospels, and more briefly, either explicitly or implicitly, all the minor charges likewise. Fifth, by an original harmony, on a simple and exhaustive plan, as well analytical as chronological, to exhibit the order in time and logical connection of all the events and discourses related in these Gospels. Sixth, finally to append notes and dissertations on the more difficult passages, detailing and discussing the evidence for both text and translation, controverting erroneous criticism and

Digitized by Google

doctrine, confirming the genuineness of certain principal disputed sections, and establishing throughout the real value and proper application of critical materials. Such, we repeat, has been our endeavour. '*In quantum mihi ex deo est virtus,*' as was the pious determination of Origen, '*ut fideles non solum fide simplici, sed etiam ratione fidei muniantur in fide.*'" [a]

Upon the execution of the plan and purpose, unfolded by the author in the foregoing extract from his preface, it is evident that he has expended a great amount of searching, conscientious, and unsparing labour. For instance:

"In order," he says, "to reascertain, confirm, and settle the full force and meaning of every word, phrase, and construction of the original (in preparation for his new translation of the Greek Testament), we have diligently explored anew the whole domain of Greek literature, sacred and profane, down to the close of the fourth century of our era, with many later portions, paying particular attention to those less known authors whose writings fall within the period of B.C. 250—A.D. 250; thus for the first time utilizing for the amendment of the English Version the entire body of original authorities which Divine providence has preserved in this department." [b]

Industry like this on behalf of the great cause of Biblical criticism, revision, and exegesis, is above all praise. In the interests of his own book, however, we deem it a serious mistake of procedure that Mr. McClellan has not given the "pure original Greek text," from which he has desired to produce "a most faithful and exact English translation." Surely it is a singular and unreasonable thing to ask the public to accept a new translation of the Gospels produced from a text of his own formation, and to keep that text out of sight, so precluding satisfactory discussion of the one by the absence of the other. What right has Mr. McClellan to ask us to take for granted that he has constructed "a pure original Greek text," as virtually he does by placing before us a translation from it as "a most faithful and exact" one, without furnishing adequate means of fairly testing the critical value of the one or the accuracy of the other?

So far as Mr. McClellan has unfolded the principles upon which he has constructed his Greek text, and so far as he has supplied any specimens of it, our judgment is that were that text before us, it should be subjected to the keenest and most suspicious scrutiny. For in two important particulars the principles upon which his text is formed seem to be erroneous and dangerous. In the first place, not only is manuscript authority apparently insufficiently attended to, but the most ancient extant copies are denounced as careless, depraved, corrupt, etc.

[a] Page xi. [b] Page 47.

Digitized by Google

In doing this Mr. McClellan separates himself from, and puts himself in array against, nearly the whole body of critics. The method he adopts to convince his readers "of the reasonableness" of his own conviction of the greater purity and integrity of the *Textus Receptus* over the latest and most celebrated critical editions of the Greek text, and the correctness of his own estimation of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., is simply astounding. A table is presented,[c] exhibiting in one column a certain number of readings from the *Textus Receptus* and in another the readings from the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., together with the names of principal modern Editors who have admitted these readings into their texts. This list is headed "Select List of Errors and Grave Corruptions in the Two Most Antient MSS.," etc. Was there ever a more notable instance of vicious arguing in a circle? First, the Received Readings are assumed by Mr. McClellan to be the right ones, thus thoroughly begging the question; then the readings of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS. are pronounced to be erroneous and corrupt, as differing from them, and the Editors who have adopted these readings are placarded as guilty of servile submission.

We give a specimen of this table:—

Received Reading.	*Reading of Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., and names of modern Editors following them.*
Matt. xix. 16, 17. Good Teacher, etc. Why callest thou me good?	Teacher, What good thing, etc. Why askest thou me concerning good?—p. 659. Greisbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.[d]

Now it is of course quite possible that the received reading may be the right one, and the judgment of the Editors may be in fault, though singularly enough Mr. McClellan himself at first concurred with them, and embodied their reading in his own text, subsequently repudiating it in his notes; but it is rather too much for him to call upon us so to bow to his revised judgment as to assume the consequent error and corruption of the MSS. in question. Yet, having completed his list, he has the audacity to say,—

"Here, for awhile at least, we may stop. The *reductio ad absurdum* is already complete. The unreliable character of the two most ancient MSS. is demonstrated."[e] "By a strictly mathematical process, then, the specious principle of servile submission to the most ancient surviving witnesses is, by its results, proved to be false"!![f]

[c] Page 30. [d] Page 31. [e] Page 34. [f] Page 35.

Digitized by Google

But we have yet graver exceptions to take to the principles on which Mr. McClellan has constructed his text, in the undue and perilous weight which he assigns to subjective considerations in determining between conflicting readings. But on this point it is well that we should let our author speak for himself. He says:—

"The principle, therefore, of appeal to *directly extant* antiquity must be modified by appeal to *indirectly extant* antiquity. And, in the decision between conflicting witnesses (and the witnesses do conflict in almost every verse), much greater deference must be shown to the higher claims of the *internal* evidence, and one 'Canon of Internal Evidence,' to which we venture to assign the title of the Golden Canon, must be invested with supremacy: viz., *That no reading can possibly be original which contradicts the context of the passage or the tenor of the writing.* We admit that this assigns considerable weight to the subjective element, and gravely enhances the difficulty of decisions; but, inasmuch as not a single one of the external witnesses possesses a fixed mathematical value, it is simply one of the absolute necessities of the case."

Acting upon the principle enunciated in the foregoing passage, Mr. McClellan does not hesitate in some instances to put aside the most overwhelming manuscript evidence and the almost unanimous judgment of the critics, and upon subjective grounds mainly to adopt a reading opposed both to the one and to the other. A notable example of this occurs in connection with John xvii. 11. The reading which is supported by an immense preponderance of MSS. and several versions, and which consequently is adopted by all the Editors, with two exceptions, runs thus: "Keep them in Thy name which Thou hast given Me" (ᾧ δεδωκάς). This reading Mr. McClellan at first adopted, yielding to the enormous evidence supporting it, but subsequently abandoned in favour of the reading ὃ δεδωκὰς, notwithstanding that this rests only on three Uncials, a few Cursives, and some Versions. His rendering of the passage as thus read is, "Preserve them in Thy name, that which Thou hast given Me." We will give in the author's own words the grounds on which he puts aside the one reading and prefers the other:—

"After weighing over again Mr. Malan's corrected exhibition of the Egyptian and Syriac versions, which entirely alters the aspect of the question of the reading, we have now no doubt whatever that the accusative neuter ὅ, referring to the *body* of believers, is the true reading, and that the dative ᾧ, referring to the *name* of God, is, as Stier, 'a grammatical alteration, which misunderstood the meaning,' and the masc. ὃν, *whom*, as A.V., a correct explanation, and *possibly, for general readers, the best rendering.* First, the neuter ὅ, *that which*, in apposition with the remote masc. ἀυτὸυς, *them*, most easily accounts for the variations, as attempts to remove the difficulty of construction. *The evidence for* ὃν, especially as

Digitized by Google

regards the versions, *is just so much additional evidence for ὅ*. Next, the *corporate unity* implied in the apposition is one of the leading thoughts in the prayer, as already seen in ver. 2, and repeated in ver. 24, where there is a similar variety of reading. Third, the facts of the *gift of the disciples themselves* to Christ by the Father, and their *separation from the world*, are evidently the strong grounds on which this portion of the prayer relies in its appeal for their preservation. Lastly (not to speak of rhythm), it is almost, if not altogether, impossible to assign any satisfactory sense to the statement of the other reading, of the *gift of the Father's own name* to Christ, although S. Cyril attempts it. Now, with the reading ὅ, how affectingly does the intercession rise in fervour and power! How tenderly it pleads! How earnestly it wrestles! Yes, much more so even than with the *whom* of A. V. which yet happily retained the correct *personal* application: '*Holy Father, preserve them in Thy name,—them, that gift of Thine to Me,—that body, that little flock, which Thou hast given Me,—that they may be one as we are!*'"

Now in an edition of the Greek Testament constructed on critical principles such as these, we can have little confidence. Given infallibility, given an inspired insight into the meaning of Holy Scripture, and Mr. McClellan's golden canon would indeed become paramount; but in the absence of these it seems to us only a canon authorizing Editors to prefer their own sense of what a passage ought to be to any amount of documentary evidence. The use which the author has made of the canon in the construction of his text, so far as we understand it from his translations and notes, will not, we think, commend its adoption to others.

Produced as Mr. McClellan's new translation is from a Greek text so constructed, we confess to approaching the consideration of it with some misgiving, and certainly with much less interest than otherwise we might have come to it. Putting aside, however, this ground of objection, we propose to look at our author's English Version simply as a translation. This we cannot say altogether fulfils the promise held out to us of "a most faithful and exact English translation, upon the basis of our endeared and venerable Authorized Version, which, while never departing to any unnecessary extent from the style and diction now happily familiar to the Church, shall yet satisfy the most rigid demands of sound and accurate scholarship." In the first place, we are unable to see in many instances any cogent reason, either as a matter of scholarship or of force and propriety of expression, for numerous departures from the style and diction of the Authorized Version. Some of them seem uncouth and others inaccurate. We fail, for example, to see the advantage or necessity of substituting "Friday" for "Preparation day," "Captain" for "Centurion," "Battalion" for "Band," "Con-

Digitized by Google

stables" for "Officers," etc. The "Burning Valley" does not commend itself as a translation of *τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός*, nor "cause thee to fall backward into a deadly snare," as a rendering of *σκανδαλίζῃ*, nor "a boulder of a rock" as an equivalent of *πέτρος*. Further, we think that again and again *αὐτὸς* is needlessly rendered "he himself" where no such emphasis is conveyed by the original,—*e.g.*, in Luke xvi. 24, which Mr. McClellan renders "he himself called." No doubt in other places,—*e.g.*, Matt. i. 21,—the word is emphatic, and is rightly rendered "he himself," though in this instance we are disposed to think the emphasis might even yet more forcibly be rendered by "it is He that shall save," etc.

While, however, we feel compelled to take exception to a good many of Mr. McClellan's renderings, we have no hesitation in saying that, on the whole, it is a translation of considerable merit, and that it is one which the Revisers of our Authorized English Version might consult with advantage. Moreover, its value in this respect is greatly enhanced by the marginal notes, containing copious exegetical quotations from original authorities, elucidating and confirming the renderings in the text, and explaining historical and geographical allusions, etc.

Mr. McClellan presents us with a harmony of the Gospels, both chronological and analytical, which is worthy of most attentive study. In a special Introduction to this he endeavours to unfold the rules of composition by which he thinks the Evangelists were guided in giving form to their respective narratives, and he discusses the principal discrepancies which have been alleged against them. Most assuredly our author does not always carry us along with him to the conclusions which, characteristically, he himself deems irresistible. He writes, moreover, too much as if he had actually got inside of the mind of each writer. Still these discussions display considerable acuteness, erudition, and painstaking investigation, so that the perusal of them will repay the reader, even though at the end he may not be, in each instance, convinced that the results of Mr. McClellan's method of procedure are so "triumphantly vindicatory" as he himself pronounces them to be. We would invite special attention to the discussions on the Genealogies of our Lord, the Order and Organism of St. Luke's Gospel, the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, the Denials of St. Peter, and the Narrative of the Resurrection. It is not without reason that he claims to have drawn forth from his investigation of the four Gospels most valuable testimony to their truthfulness, in refutation of the impugners of them. "They have cast (*i.e.*, Strauss and others) the Gospels 'bound' into the furnace of criticism, 'heated seven times more than it was wont to be

Digitized by Google

heated;' and lo! these Gospels have 'walked loose and unhurt in the midst of the fire,' and have come forth unscathed, 'neither has the smell of fire passed upon them.' 'The form of the Fourth is like the Son of God.'"

The volume concludes with Notes, critical and exegetical, upon select passages. From these we have already adduced some extracts. We entirely dissent from some of the views expressed in these notes, but we cordially recognise the interest and value of many of them, as, for example, on Matthew vi. 11; Mark ii. 26; Luke vi. 1; John vii. 53 to viii. 11; xiv. 16, 26; xix 14.

Our space does not permit us to do more than indicate by the foregoing references portions which we desire to commend to the perusal of our readers, in which are certain points which we would gladly have discussed in a friendly way with the author. It is a fair token of the real value of this book, that the further it is examined into, the greater is the interest felt in it, notwithstanding the author's provoking self-complacency. We have not hesitated to expose and to rebuke the tone and spirit by which his pages are marred, and by which, too probably, their acceptableness will be prejudiced. With all the more emphasis, therefore, would we conclude this notice by recording our conviction that, spite of its unquestionable blemishes and, as we think, its not unfrequent errors, this work is the production of an earnest Christian, a diligent and conscientious student, and a scholar of varied and extensive eruditiou.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Coulyng Castle. By Agnes Giberne. London: Seeley. 1875. Amongst other foreign customs imported amongst us is what is the counterpart of the feuilleton which forms so conspicuous a feature of the French newspaper. Many of our writers of fiction now address a double circle of readers. Trial is made of popularity in some serial, and afterwards there is an appeal to the general public. So it has been with the present volume. The readers of *Our Own Fireside* will recognise the tale, but those who are not familiar with that publication will be glad to have it brought to their notice. It is a tale of Lollardism, in which the fortunes of Sir John Oldcastle and Lord Cobham are recounted, with an admixture of fiction which has been very skilfully managed. The aim of Miss Giberne, in this respect, has been "to present a truthful picture of castle life and manners in the olden time," and we think she may fairly be congratulated on her success. The tone and teaching of the story are admirable, and we can heartily commend it as a safe and instructive book to put into the hands of young persons.

Digitized by Google

Publications of the Religious Tract Society. London: 1875.—A fresh batch of these is on our table, containing several items of interest and value. "The World before the Flood, and the Patriarchs" is a volume of sterling interest, by Dr. Edersheim. It is full of instructive and valuable comments upon the portion of Scripture which falls within its limits, and will quite fulfil the threefold object which the author proposed to himself of supplying useful matter for teachers, for family reading, and for young men as a prophylactic against misrepresentations of the Word of God. It is the first volume of a series in course of publication.—"The Young Botanist" is a very attractive volume, which we have perused with great pleasure. Its aim is not ambitious; it is only intended for very young folk, but it will be found most useful for them. The information upon the delightful topics which it treats of is most clear, and thoroughly easy to be understood, with careful avoidance of technical terms. When it has been impossible to avoid them, they have been carefully explained. It is profusely illustrated.—"Pain Quotidien Illustré, avec Versets, Quatrains, et Gravures" is a style of book very familiar to English readers, but is a novelty in its foreign guise. The idea is happily conceived and well executed. English children might be tempted from it to familiarize themselves with French, and would gain wholesome instruction in a pleasant manner. For distribution among friends or relations abroad it would have an especial value.—"The Door Without a Knocker, and other Tales" is a volume by Mrs. Prosser. One of them has already appeared in *The Leisure Hour* and obtained popularity there. We do not doubt that they will be very acceptable in a collected form.—Our readers will not expect us to commend afresh Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" to their notice; it will assuredly suffice to say that the present edition is in clear large type, admirably suited for persons defective in sight or facility of reading. We know of no edition more suitable for such persons.—"Elijah the Tishbite," by Dr. Krummacher, again, needs not further approval; it has taken its place as a classical book for religious readers. The present translation is a new one, and reads well; it is neat and moderate in cost.—The "Hymn Book for Mission Services and Cottage Meetings" is exceedingly well adapted for its specific object; some of the most recent and popular tunes will be found in it, as will many old-established favourites. It is thoroughly sound in doctrine; we wish we could say as much for all hymn books, or indeed for most of them.—"Watching for Jesus" is a small tractate on the duty of individual effort for saving souls, and enforces this duty upon all Christians; in the course of it Mr. Dickson offers many valuable hints as to how the duty is to be discharged.—A number of "Sunday School Reward Tickets," in packets numbered from A. to G., differing in beauty and importance, have been forwarded to us; some of them are magnifical. All of them will be attractive and welcome to children.

Family Readings on the Thessalonians By the Rev. W. Niven, B.D. London: Hatchards. 1875.—These readings are characterized throughout by that vein of sober thought and sterling piety which

Digitized by Google

made Mr. Niven's ministry for so long a period acceptable and profitable to a congregation of more than average spirituality and intelligence. In the epistles upon which Mr. Niven is commenting in his present volume there might be much temptation to diverge into extravagance of interpretation, and to broach fresh fancies different from those usually received by Christians; but there is not the slightest indulgence in crotchets. We can heartily recommend the volume as one eminently well-calculated for the purpose for which it is designed,—of furnishing brief instruction in Scripture, with suitable practical application adapted to the circumstances of a Christian household. The multiplication of books of this substantial character is an evidence that notwithstanding the much foolishness which is abounding, there are multitudes who can heartily relish plain and faithful exposition of Holy Scripture, without any sophistication or perversion of its natural meaning and purport.

The Primitive and Catholic Faith in relation to the Church of England. By the Rev. Bourchier Wrey Savile, M.A., &c. London: Longmans. 1875.—We have to thank Mr. Savile for a very timely volume, containing many sharp but wholesome strictures upon the foolish and mischievous innovations which are being introduced, in the teeth of all law and order, into the Church of England. Mr. Savile has had a vigilant eye upon all these absurdities, and denounces them with sweeping but most merited censure. The work will be found most useful for those who want to know the fantastic folly which is indulged in in some churches. We can add, however, that these are still few and far between, or it would be woe for the Church of England. Throughout the book there is abundant evidence of extensive reading, which has enabled the author to vindicate the positions which he maintains with many pertinent quotations of a most telling character. It will, therefore, be found very serviceable by those who are constrained to enter into controversy on the subject of Ritualism in all its various developments. While there is of necessity a good deal which is trite in a matter so unceasingly under discussion, Mr. Savile has still managed to adduce many facts and statements with which general readers are not familiar. We have been almost tempted to quote some of them; but upon consideration it seemed more fair to the author to refer our readers to the book itself, which will be found pleasant and profitable reading. It is due to Mr. Savile also to add that there is a spiritual tone prevalent throughout, which, even when he is constrained to animadvert upon what may fairly be termed heathenish practices, will be found savoury by those who attach importance to the exhibition of Christian charity and courtesy even in the midst of the most envenomed controversy. How signally the promoters of Ritualism have failed in this essentially Christian characteristic is only too notorious: abuse has been substituted for argument, perhaps with deliberate calculation, for there are multitudes who can relish the one and are wholly incompetent to appreciate the other. We hope the book will be extensively read, and find a place in many parochial libraries of a superior class, for which purpose it is well adapted.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

It is a curious characteristic of the present condition of public affairs that the questions, so far as home politics are concerned, which are exciting public attention, are not political, hardly even social, but may rather be termed religious and ecclesiastical. We do not mean to say that there has not throughout the session of Parliament been introduced a number of measures affecting the welfare of the community, but none of them have interested the public to any appreciable extent, and the opposition to them has been languid. Bills relating to Friendly Societies, Artisans' Dwellings, Public Health, Savings Banks, and similar topics, have been introduced and forwarded several stages, but comparatively little attention has been paid to them in or out of the House of Commons. We may notice, however, with some hope we trust, that Government has undertaken to deal with the painful subject of Vivisection, and that there is a prospect of eventual legislation upon the subject. It is a grievous thing that cold-blooded atrocity should be considered indispensable to the progress of science. The Permissive Bill has been again rejected by the House, but not so as to discourage the advocates of temperance from making further efforts to promote their cause: we should heartily rejoice in the success of any measure which should make England sober as well as free. The freedom to get drunk is a perilous liberty, and might be safely abridged in the interests of the helpless slaves of intoxication.

Chief interest, however, has been excited about religious questions. What has stirred the popular mind has been, not debates in Parliament, but the vigorous and homely preaching of Messrs. Moody and Sankey and their coadjutors. We can rejoice unfeignedly at the evident manner in which this revival movement has been owned and blessed of God. We wish we could feel the same assurance with regard to the Brighton Convention, under the auspices of Mr. Pearsall Smith, but there have been so manifestly questionable views propounded, and elements of unsoundness conspicuous, that we can only hope that the good may predominate, and that no serious evil may result.

Upon ecclesiastical legislation we need hardly dwell. The Bill for the Increase of the Episcopate is menaced with opposition. Unless it can be made perfectly clear that there is no intention upon the part of the promoters to divert the funds at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, for the multiplication of Bishops, instead of the relief of poor incumbencies, we can hardly wish it success. The St. Alban's Bishopric Bill

Digitized by Google

may be considered as passed, and as a step in the right direction. It may be possible that some of our Bishops may be overtaxed with work, but by a redistribution of salaries the evil might be met. The Church Patronage Bill, divested of clauses interfering with private patronage, but remedying some scandals distressing the Church, has been read a third time in the House of Lords. We regret, from the profound respect we entertain for the Bishop of Lincoln, to have to express our deep regret at the offensive utterances of his Chancellor, Mr. Phillimore, when delivering what he called his judgment in the Owston tombstone case. By such extravagant language the Church is grievously wounded in the house of her friends.

It is pleasant to be able to record that a more pacific tone seems to prevail upon the Continent of Europe than when we last wrote. Warlike rumours are for the nonce hushed. In Belgium alone, so long the stronghold of Romanism, furious opposition seems to be aroused against Ultramontane intrigues. There have been riots with bloodshed, and many indications that that most priest-ridden nation is uneasy under the galling yoke of Rome. France, smitten with infatuation, has been devoted by her priests to the most abject fetish worship; a new church has been erected on Montmartre with much ecclesiastical pomp, but amidst the sullen discontent of the population, while the rulers of the nation were conspicuously absent. Under the guise of urging religious liberty, efforts have been made, with some success, by Mgr. Dupanloup, to obtain liberty for Jesuit Colleges, and the power of conferring degrees by other than Government Institutions. It is a doubtful gain. We are glad, however, to see that under the auspices of the Foreign Evangelization Society successful efforts are being made to preach the Gospel in Paris; we would gladly direct attention to this most important movement, which ought to be the work of French Protestants, if Rationalism had not devoured their strength and left them helpless for good in the presence of the abject superstitions of Rome.

It is with much concern we notice a fearful outbreak of measles in the Fiji Islands, which has wrought havoc amongst the native population, of the most disastrous kind.

The Sultan of Zanzibar is now on a visit to England. Efforts are being made to call the attention of his Highness to the atrocities which have so long been perpetrated under his rule by East African slave traders. We trust good may result.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 8. AUGUST. [1875.

THE WORD.

WHAT is the Gospel? What was that "Gospel" which our Lord began to preach "unto the poor;" which He sent His disciples to announce; which He afterwards commanded the Apostles to preach to every creature, and which they, specially endowed by the Spirit, did so preach, and of which Paul, the foremost in the work, said that he was "not ashamed," but hastened to declare in all the ancient centres of wit and culture, civilization and empire; and which the Apocalyptic angel was seen flying in the midst of heaven to publish? What was it? Was it a revelation, or an emblem? a word, or a sign? a truth, or a type? a message, or a mystery? Was it good tidings to be received, or was it a code of rites to be performed? Did it appeal to the understanding, or to the senses? Was it a principle, or a cult? After Christianity has been eighteen hundred years in the world, we are driven by what we see around us to ask these questions, —questions which to propose, is to answer,—for with one voice do the Scriptures declare that it is not the latter of these alternatives, but the former. And this is nowhere more distinctly taught than in the great key parable of our Lord's ministry,—the Parable of the Sower,—to which we would now invite attention.

We see here the typical Sower—primarily, indeed, the Son of man, but including representatively all His commissioned ambassadors—going forth on his evangelistic work, not to convert the world, but to test men's hearts, and make manifest those who would receive the Divine gift, and those who would reject it; even as St. James spoke, in the Council of Jerusalem, of God visiting the Gentiles "to take out of them a people for His name." And what is the seed he bears with him to scatter among the nations? Simply a "word,"—a message, a revelation of the Divine will, showing to lost souls the way, the truth, and

Digitized by Google

the life. He sets forth unburdened with any material apparatus; he is not one of a *troupe*,—a travelling company of performers with crucifix and censer, pix and picture, rosary and relic. He needs not the cart of Thespis, with strange raiment and quaint gesture, to attract an audience. His audience is waiting ready for his approach, wherever there is a hard heart to soften, a broken heart to heal, a wandering heart to guide, or "an honest and good heart" that shall "bring forth fruit with patience." An eunuch riding in his chariot, a terrified jailor, a party of worshippers at a river side, a centurion's household,—these were among the earliest audiences of this typical Word-sower. Very simple, very natural, infinitely removed from all artificial attraction and sensational device is his method: he builds no altars, inducts into no mysteries, heads no pilgrimages, affects no philosophical abstruseness or dialectic subtlety; but his only instrument is a Book,—and if that be taken from him his work ceases not, but he sows still; perhaps in the words of the Book, —for he carries them in his heart; but if not, yet by his life which, impregnated by the Book, is continually sending forth vitalizing influences, even from the captive's dungeon and the martyr's fire. And these influences, like the seeds of wild flowers, are sometimes sown without any recognised agent. The tract hung upon a hedge-row thorn, the Sunday-school hymn or lesson repeated by the child at home, the text turned down in the Bible by "a vanished hand," the passing word, the leaflet in the letter, are sufficient for this work, and will sometimes do it effectually where the argument and oratory of the speaker have failed. So that there is evidently in this sowing an agency at work beyond, and independent of, the individual human sower. In himself he is to be, indeed, officially accredited; for "how can they preach unless they be sent?" And it is very observable that when the Holy Spirit called Barnabas and Saul to their particular work, the order was not to them but to the Church: "Separate me, Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them,"—a standing, divine protest against all self-constituted spiritual quixotism; yet is this official accreditedness only a law to the individual, and no necessary element in the effectiveness of his work. The work has to be done, and when the appointed Hosannah-singers are silent, the stones cry out. The itinerant revivalist is at once God's rebuke and remedy in the case of ecclesiastical unfaithfulness.

Of the typical Sower we observe further that, as he seeks not to attract an audience, so neither does he try to prepare one. His office is to cast abroad the seed, anywhere and everywhere, leaving its lodgment and fructification for a higher Power to direct: for it is a feature of the Word-seed that it is not con-

Digitized by Google

sumed by use, nor wasted by failure. So he is not careful to plough and to dress; but he throws it broadcast, allowing some to fall by the way-side, and some on stony ground, and some on thorny. He no more seeks to open a way for the Word, than the rifleman to make a path for the ball: the Word is its own preparation, pioneer, and path-finder. So he does not preach civilization to the savage, or education to the ignorant, or abstinence to the drunkard, or apologetics to the sceptic, or natural theology to the infidel; but he presents one Saviour and one Gospel to all alike, well knowing that if these be received all is won, and that while these are unknown or disregarded no preliminary training will avail.

And now let us note the results of the sowing, which show clearly the nature of the process involved. Turning to the parable as it stands in Matt. xiii., we see the first cause of failure to consist in the hearers' not "understanding" the word. The Gospel enters the heart of man by the gate of the understanding. The intellect must, to some extent at least, apprehend its meaning before it can become a power in the soul. In other words, the presentation of the Gospel is a matter of speech and reason, not of sensuous impression or mystic charm. It does not light its candles and show the sinner æsthetic marvels of stone or canvas, jewel or flower, that he may cry, How beautiful! But it speaks to him "words which the Holy Ghost teacheth," and declares to him "the whole council of God," that he may exclaim, How true! The appeal of the Gospel is to the judgment by words, not to the fancy by emblems. We hear much of primitive use, and of the customs of apostolic antiquity; but so little account did the Apostles make of ritual that we scarcely get a glimpse of their modes of public worship throughout their writings. There is, however, one such glimpse in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, where (chap. xiv. 23—25) he compares the gift of speaking with tongues with that of prophesying; that is, a worship of unintelligent wonder with a worship of intelligent conviction, and the picture he draws is sufficiently striking: "If therefore the whole Church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." An uninterpreted "tongue" is an apt counterpart of a priest clad in mystical vestments, muttering inaudible prayers, with his back turned to the people; while in the "prophet" of the early Church we have the divinely gifted

Digitized by Google

preacher, speaking to the reason and consciences of the assembled hearers. We need not ask in which of the two portraits, so vividly set before us by the Apostle, we are to look for the typical Sower. We need not ask whether of the two is scattering the seed which may spring up to life eternal. Yet this is a too favourable illustration of the matter in hand: for the unknown tongue was a true *gift*, and had its proper function as a "sign;" while the embroidered back of a priest, performing mystic rites with whispered words, is a spectacle unknown in the New Testament.

The second cause of failure is at a more advanced stage of the process, and is yet more instructive. In the case of the seed sown in "stony places" we have a joyful reception of the Word, but an absence of "root in himself" on the part of the hearer, which incapacitates him from enduring trial and successfully meeting that opposition which the true Gospel inevitably excites in the unbelieving world. The Word, then, is a word of *joy* to the hearer. This is a most important characteristic; for it shows that God's plan of salvation can be no hazy vista of laborious observances, rigorous austerities, humiliating confessions, painful penances, issuing at last, if not in a fiery purgatory, yet in an after-death state which needs the prayers of survivors to ensure its safety and complete its satisfaction. Such is not the "word of reconciliation" which was committed to the Apostles and their followers to announce to a lost race. Sacerdotalism may make men serious, and religious, and devout: but can it fill the heart with "joy and peace in believing"? A salvation of routine, which depends on the due administration and official legitimacy of an order of our fellow-men, may be an object of anxious endeavour, but it is not "glad tidings of great joy;" those terms can only apply to a salvation immediately attainable and divinely complete.

At the same time, however, we find in this second class of hearers, that while the joyful character of the Word is intellectually apprehended and superficially realized, they fail for want of root in themselves; for the Word, like a true living seed, must take root downwards before it can bring forth fruit upwards. An inward growth in the heart is the result of its germination in the understanding, and accompanies its development in the life. By its own divine vitality it seeks to strike its roots into the innermost soul of the man, and if, as in the "stony places," it is obstructed in this,—if after being recognised by the intellect it finds the heart too hard to admit its penetrating fibres,—then, lacking power to co-operate with the genial influences, or to withstand the adverse, it withers away. Now it is to be noted that this second cause of failure, like the first, is altogether subjective. The defect is inward and personal, not outward and

Digitized by Google

circumstantial, depending on others. It is clear therefore that this underground process of esoteric growth depends not on ritual, or any priestly function, or ecclesiastical regime: it is entirely in the soul of the hearer, and known to God only. There is no intimation that the outward appliances of religion were wanting to this class of hearers, or that their growth in grace depended on such. The Sower is no actor here. For "so is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise, night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how." Human agency here has no place. No prescribed discipline, no spiritual directorship, no secret probing of the conscience in the confessional, are admissible here. The adamantine rock of an unawakened heart defies their borings; the yielding soil of a contrite heart shrinks from their intrusion.

The third cause of failure is from without, consisting in the antagonistic influence brought to bear upon the Word sown by the things of time and sense. But how does this take place? Not by conflict between the outward religious life and the world around,—such as that which monkery was instituted to obviate, —but by idolatry of the heart: the Word is "choked" within, and the man becomes "unfruitful." There is arrest of growth, and the fructification, which was the grand design in the sowing, is thwarted. But it is remarkable that the evil here produced is altogether from the world acting on man's spiritual nature. The world is introduced as the adversary, and in its overmastering influences lies the danger. But if the divine life in the soul depended on the due exercise of ecclesiastical functions,—if the union of the believer with Christ were a matter of ordinances, and ministrations, and sacraments,—then, beyond all question, the grand peril of the Christian would consist in the suspension, or inefficiency of such ordinances; and just as our physical life is jeopardised a thousandfold more by disease, or internal derangement, than by outward violence, so, on this supposition, the spiritual life would be jeopardised infinitely more by defective ordinances than by secular temptations. So long as our hold of salvation depends on the power of grace in the heart we may hope to "overcome the world," and triumph through the blood of the Lamb; but if it depends on ritual observances, turning on the correctness of ceremonies, the validity of orders, and the faithfulness of priests, then does the most terribly momentous question of our existence hang upon a thread, of which the intricacies baffle observation, and the frailty renders that "life," which the Scriptures assure us no creature can touch, and which is "hid with Christ in God," the most perilously insecure of all vital manifestations.

Digitized by Google

Lastly, after these three sources of failure have been indicated, we have the causes of success depicted. "But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the Word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty." St. Luke has it (ch. viii. 15): "But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." By combining the two passages we have probably the complete utterance, and certainly the perfect truth. First there is the mind prepared by Divine grace; for most assuredly "an honest and good heart," ready to receive worthily the Gospel message, belongs to none naturally, and can be produced by no human agency. (Phil. ii. 13.) Then there is the hearing; the intelligent contact with the intelligible message; the cognizance of the Divine proclamation; which is followed by a mental process of more or less comprehension, and personal realization, which St. Matthew calls *understanding* the Word, and St. Luke *keeping* it. The two phrases giving us the two sides of the same process,—intellection by the reason, appropriation by the heart. The Word is received, and germinates; it is retained, and bears fruit. But the whole process is inward in the individual, and is one of patient development and not laborious endeavour. Outward helps there may be, and are, in abundance, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;" but these are no channels of grace otherwise than as the faith already implanted in the soul avails to lay hold on them and appropriate their benefits.

Thus, then, this parable of the Sower places the whole work of grace and salvation in the soul itself, apart from all ecclesiastical organizations. Church life and spiritual life are distinct planes, which may intersect but not coincide. The grace of sacraments and the efficacy of ordinances are in the recipient, and not in the administrant; depending on inward faith rather than outward legitimacy. And the view of the Gospel thus presented by this key parable is maintained throughout the New Testament: it is the view which the Apostles enforced in their writings and illustrated in their conduct. With them the Gospel is a Word and not a Rite, a message and not a discipline. They did not, indeed, evacuate the sacraments, according to an ultra-Zuinglianism too common now in some quarters; no higher ground can be taken for baptism than St. Peter takes in his first Epistle, ch. iii. 21, and St. Paul in Romans vi. 3; or for the Lord's Supper than that taken by St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. (and that too pursuant to an express revelation made to him by his ascended Lord); but this ground is altogether subjective and conditional.

Digitized by Google

The baptism which saves is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God;" and the communion which unites to Christ is the faith which "discerns the Lord's body."

While therefore the inspired writers of the New Testament put all due honour on the sacraments, as the commandments of Him whose word giveth life, they uniformly represent the preached Gospel as the grand instrument of salvation. "Faith," we are told, "cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." To preach the Gospel to every creature was their original commission, and the reception or rejection thereof was to determine the eternal state of all those who heard it. When miraculously released from prison they were commanded to "stand and speak in the Temple to the people all the words of this life." So entirely independent of all Ritualistic accessories was this word that it could be effectually preached in the very Temple itself, surrounded with a sacrificial worship which it abrogated, and in the presence of a priesthood whose orders it annulled. When the prayers and alms of Cornelius had "come up for a memorial before God," he was directed to send for Peter, "who (said the angel) shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." It is to this preached Gospel that St. Peter ascribes the spiritual regeneration of the saints to whom he wrote, who were "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever;"[a] "and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." St. Paul calls it "the word of reconciliation," which was committed unto the Apostles, and in pursuance of which he, "as ambassador for Christ," entreats them to be "reconciled to God." It was not by the functions of an elaborate ceremonial that the Apostle of the Gentiles exercised and demonstrated his Apostleship, but by the earnest, faithful, and untiring ministry of the Word. He declared himself sent to preach rather than to baptize; and he found the seal of his apostleship, not in the efficacy of the sacraments he administered, but in the success of the Word which he preached. And as it was this Word by which heathen converts were at first "turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven," so by it alone he sought to effect their complete sanctification and ultimate salvation: "whom we preach, warning every man, and

[a] If there be any doubt respecting the force of this verse, the ῥῆμα in ver. 25 entirely removes it, and fixes the reference to the word preached.

Digitized by Google

teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

If we turn to the pastoral Epistles we find them full of the same spirit. Many practical directions are given to Timothy and Titus bearing on Church life and ministerial duties, but not a hint is there respecting ceremonial observances. The Gospel is everywhere, ritual is nowhere. "Preach the Word,—reprove, rebuke, exhort,—do the work of an evangelist." This is the burden of these epistles. Not a word about celebrations, no cautions as to the unspeakable reverence due to the sacred elements, not a suggestion of confession, not an allusion to absolution, not a thought about significant vestments, appropriate ornaments, and accurate posturings. And not only are these things absent, but they are absolutely excluded. There is no possible place for them: to introduce them would be a grotesque impertinence. Reading these epistles we are in an atmosphere where altar lights cannot burn and "incense is an abomination." The Apostle no more addresses the two young Bishops as sacrificing priests or private confessors, than he addresses them as merchants or lawyers. The inference is resistless, and it is crushing. If we met with a treatise on siege operations which omitted all mention of artillery, or a treatise on naval tactics which only dealt with sailing vessels, should we hesitate for a moment to ascribe them respectively to dates prior to the use of gunpowder and the introduction of steam navigation? Would any be so mad as to insist, or so weak as to believe, that they were modern treatises, recently written? Just as complete is the demonstration, just as inevitable is the conclusion, that these treatises on the duties of bishops and pastors were written when Christian sacerdotalism was a thing unknown. The importance of this argument cannot be over-rated, and it cannot be urged too persistently. Here is an eminent Apostle, not only inspired by the Spirit of God in common with the other New Testament writers, but endowed naturally with a capacious, far-seeing intellect, and especially privileged with direct revelations from the glorified Saviour, towards the close of his illustrious career writing earnest words of wisest counsel to two young men holding important and difficult positions in the newly-formed Churches, and who needed all the guidance and admonition which he could give them. And his letters are equal to the occasion, worthy to be the farewell utterances of such a man, and to be bequeathed as an inspired legacy to the Church through all time. But in all their amplitude of statement, full even to reiteration, there is one department of action on which they never touch, which they absolutely ignore. And that is a department supposed to cover truths so vital, mysteries so

Digitized by Google

profound, and moral complications so delicate, that the perverse ingenuity of ages has laboured in vain to explore and exhaust its infinite intricacies; for so it is, that while the duties of the preacher and the pastor are dwelt upon throughout, the mysteries of the altar, and the perils of the confessional are never so much as hinted at. Until this omission is explained the sacerdotal school is in hopeless antagonism with the greatest writer of the New Testament, and its principles must be acknowledged to be utterly unwarranted by the Christian Scriptures.

But it is only the half the truth to say that the sacerdotal theory is entirely unsupported by Scriptural authority: that which the New Testament does authoritatively enforce and prominently exalt, sacerdotalism contemns and neglects. With singular perversity it sets up a system unknown to Scripture, while the distinguishing element in the Gospel dispensation it weakens and dishonours. That preached Word, of the peculiar honour put upon which by the inspired writers we have been adducing a few instances,—though to exhaust all their multitudinous references to it would be to transcribe half their epistles,—is relegated to a position of such insignificance as to paralyse its operation and extinguish its force. It is to sacerdotalism that we owe the modern *sermonette:* a sermon of ten minutes duration, made up of borrowed platitudes, and delivered in a style that would not be tolerated in a public speaker in any secular assembly. It is to this unpardonable bathos that vestments, and candles, and crosses, and incense, and music, and flowers are bringing the pulpit. And it must be so. With the exception of a few rare instances, where the talent of the preacher will make itself felt and refuses to be smothered in vapid sensuousness, the effect of sacerdotalism is to eliminate intellect from our services, and to substitute ceremony and spectacle for that copious, heart-searching proclamation of the Gospel message which is God's chosen instrument in turning men "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." And these exceptional instances will grow scarcer every day, as intelligence and ability revolt more and more against a system which subordinates their highest function to the music of the choir and the display of fantastic vestments. To reduce the sermon to the limits now sought to be assigned to it is, beyond all question, practically to abolish it. Can the reverent attention of a congregation be secured, can the great truths of Scripture be worthily set forth, the manifold lessons they teach be usefully applied, and the appeal be brought home effectually to the individual conscience under such circumstances? It is evident that they cannot, it is notorious that they are not. It is an affront to the auditory, an affront to the Bible, and, we must add with all seriousness, an affront to Him

Digitized by Google

who instituted the sacred office of the pulpit, and who ought to be its all-pervading theme, to restrict the solemn utterances of the ambassadors of eternal truth to such conditions. The obvious effect is to lower public respect for the Word of God. It is from the pulpit that the written Word becomes vocal, and its momentous import is borne in upon the judgment and conscience of the hearers. But what subject could be treated by a speaker, honestly and successfully, by such a method? What impression can the thoughtless or sceptical take away, but that a matter that can be thus satisfactorily disposed of in ten minutes a week is one of such subordinate importance, or of so shallow a nature, as to be practically beneath notice? But, alas, we are not left to inference on this point! Ignorance of Scriptural truth is the grand source of Ritualistic superstition, and a lucid exegesis is the terror of priestcraft. The same instinct which leads the Church of Rome to keep back the Bible from the people leads her imitators to dishonour its public exposition. The light is put out in the pulpit that the glitter of the chancel may be the better seen.

And when we consider what the ordinance of preaching is, and what potentialities lie in that priceless opportunity which custom has given to the preacher, we may well deplore such a state of things with a sorrow beyond the sorrow of earth and time. By the good providence of God there is this weekly half-hour, in the high noon of Sabbath, when fashion and frivolity are willing to be serious, when worldliness consents to appear devout, when avarice closes his strong-box, when labour is permitted to rest, and there is something of a lull even on the restless iron road. It is then that the man of God, set apart and disciplined for the office, the "scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," bearing in his hand the Divine book, ascends the pulpit, and proceeds to open out those saving doctrines, those rich veins of thought, those hidden treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which with toil of brain and stress of love and fervour of prayer, in the comparative seclusion of the week, he has won from the exhaustless mine of revealed truth. God speed the message! Oh, blessed opportunity! Oh, priceless half-hour! Is there not a world in which the burning memory of the loss and waste of such half-hours turns remorse to madness? But sacerdotalism has no sympathy with this. Rather would she debase the pulpit, dwarf the sermon, starve the intellect, stifle the living voice, that a gorgeous ceremonial and a spectacular worship may fill the imagination and captivate the sense. Well did the Apostle, as by prophetic inspiration, utter the warning, "Despise not prophesyings." A contempt for preaching is a contempt for Christianity.

Digitized by Google

For it were a great mistake to look upon preaching as mere mission work; as a calling in of the wanderers that once in the fold, they might be henceforth pastured by priests and confessors; as a rudimentary instruction in the first principles of the Gospel, to be succeeded by the deeper teaching of æsthetic symbolism and hierurgic mysteries. On the contrary, the same Gospel Word which converts the sinner, perfects the saint. For "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." It were strange indeed if a process begun in the intellect should be perfected in the senses: if the doctrines lucidly explained and logically established in the pulpit, should need to be emblematised in a vestment, or an altar cloth, before their spiritual efficacy were complete. In fact, as the Word appeals to the understanding at first, so it continues to do to the end.

It is remarkable that in the only two instances in which the adjective λογικός (if we remember rightly) occurs in the New Testament it is applied, in the one, to the word of the Gospel, and, in the other, to Christian worship. St. Peter in his first Epistle, ch. ii. 2, exhorts believers "to desire, as new-born babes, the sincere milk of the word,"—τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα,—*the pure intellectual milk*,[b]—"that they may *grow* thereby." St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, ch. xii. 1, urges believers "by the mercies of God" to present their "bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which," says he, "is your reasonable service,"—τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν,—*your rational worship*: a religious service not only *reasonable* in the modern sense, as conformable with right reason, but a service or worship which belongs to the reason, and has its seat and agency in the understanding; as if immediately on the mention of a Christian sacrifice the Apostle would hasten to define his meaning and to limit it to a spiritual sphere, thus showing that the most exalted act of Christian worship, or service, is an act of the mind, by virtue of its rational relationship to truth, and no bodily performance of mystic rites.

But our charge against the "Catholic revival" is not only that it subordinates the ministrations of the pulpit, which are the distinctive agency of the Gospel, to an excessive ritualism altogether unwarranted by the New Testament, but that the dwarfed and crippled influence which it permits the pulpit to retain is

---

[b] So the Syriac: ואתרגרנו לה למלתא : איך דלחלבא נקדא ורוחנא
Luther makes the *rationabile sine dolo lac* of the Vulgate by *der vernunftigen lautern Milch*; the French gives *le lait d' intelligence qui est tout pur*; Diodati agrees with our Authorized Version.

Digitized by Google

too often made the vehicle of error rather than of truth. When a system like that of sacerdotal ritualism takes possession of a preacher's mind, it necessarily shapes his own religious life, colours his experience, controls his studies, directs his sympathies; and the Gospel which such an one sets forth is not the Gospel pure and simple as taught by the Apostles, and left to us in their writings, but a Gospel which comes to us through the medium of the Church, the sacraments, and a priesthood, and which therefore renders *these* things the first in importance to preacher and hearer. Thus the doctrine of the Fall may be preached, but it is in connection with a theory of baptismal regeneration which practically does away with it. The atonement may be preached, but it is accompanied with a theory of an oft-repeated sacrifice which robs it of its completeness and its force. Justification may be preached, but it is made to depend practically upon a priestly absolution consequent upon a confession, of neither of which can any trace be found in the practice or writings of the Apostles. Sanctification may be preached, but it is tied down to a sacramental act, from which all due recognition of the Spirit's agency—whose alone office it is to "sanctify all the elect people of God"—is virtually excluded; while the efficacy of the same sacramental act is so exaggerated as to thrust quite out of sight its commemorative value and its prophetic aspect. The past and future in the "mass" of the Catholic revival are absorbed in a tremendous *present*. To the communicant who believes that he has his Saviour in his hands, there needs no distant retrospect of Calvary to strengthen his faith, and no pledge of a second coming to confirm his hope. "For what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" Why should he linger upon the past, or yearn for the future, when his Lord is present with him already in the closest and intensest union, not of which his nature is susceptible, but of which it would be susceptible if his wild dreams of impossible contradictions were true? It is in the personal absence of the Redeemer that the Church waits and prays and longs for His glorious coming again. Can the Spirit say "Come" to Him who is already present on the altar? Can the Bride say "Come" to Him whom,—regardless of any prohibitory "Touch me not" (2 Cor. v. 16),—she clasps already? The Second Advent holds a very subordinate place in the faith of Rome and her admirers. It is the part of an unfaithful Church rather to speculate upon her Lord's delay than to long for His return.

Thus does sacerdotalism vitiate even the shred of influence which is left by it to the preached Word; and seeing this, and seeing how such a state of things is no exceptional aberration, but an evil essentially belonging to the system, it becomes a

Digitized by Google

solemn question how far the words of the ancient oracle are finding a fulfilment amongst ourselves: "The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

E. J. J.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D.

Autobiography of Thomas Guthrie, D.D. London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co.

THE completion of Dr. Guthrie's life has no doubt been anxiously looked for by many, as it has been by ourselves; nor do we think the work at all calculated to disappoint expectation, except perhaps in one point, which is certainly no fault of the compiler's: *i.e.*, that the fragment of his autobiography which he did not live to accomplish, should have been so short. But such as it is, we value it, not only for its intrinsic merit, but also as a reflection of the mind of one who was universally beloved by all who knew him, and by many who, like ourselves, never had the privilege of being in his company. Harsh and guttural as the name of Guthrie sounds, it always is musical to our ears, because it brings before our minds the image of a man whose many attractive qualities were softened and sweetened by a genial sympathy with and a general spirit of benevolence towards the whole human race, more especially the younger portion of it.

Thomas Guthrie was of humble, but respectable descent. His grandfather was a rich farmer. Both he and his wife were pious people; but the grandmother was evidently the stronger vessel of the two, and it was to her that Dr. Guthrie attributes that force of will, and decision of purpose, which characterized himself and his family. His father began business at Brechin, and was for a long time a leading magistrate and chief provost of that town. He married early in life, and Thomas, the youngest of his family, was born July 12th, 1803. In person, as well as mental constitution, Guthrie was more his mother's than his father's child, "adding one to many instances on record," his biographer remarks, "of eminent men about whom this has been true" (p. 251, vol. i.); and "it would be impossible," he adds elsewhere, "to exaggerate the influence of his mother in her son's future career." To use a quaint expression employed by an old retainer in the family, when speaking of his earliest days, "he drank in the Gospel with his mother's milk." His own testimony was to the same effect. (P. 253, vol. i.) His first preceptor was

Digitized by Google

Jamie Stewart, a man whom he esteemed and loved, and of whom he has given a beautiful description in one of his memoirs. (P. 235, vol. i.) He was afterwards a pupil of Dr. M'Crie, celebrated as the author of the life of John Knox. Then he was transferred to a more advanced school, where he began to exhibit, in an act of insubordination, symptoms of that same resolution and energy of character, which, under the influence of grace, afterwards manifested themselves in a dauntless adherence to what he believed to be the right cause. In the spring of 1815, he went to read with the Rev. Dr. Simpson, previously to entering College at Edinburgh, whither he was conducted by his tutor, at twelve years of age. Here he lived rather a hard life, as was generally the case with students in those days; for besides the expense of fees, books, tutor, etc., he only cost his father ten pounds. It was indeed unreasonable to expect growing youths to study hard on such meagre fare as they lived on in Dr. Guthrie's college days. He admits that in those days penuriousness may have been carried to excess, but he thinks it the right extreme, and contrasts it very favourably with the system of pampering the appetite, which exists at Oxford and Cambridge. You can hardly compare these latter Universities with Edinburgh, because of the difference of age in the scholars; but as regards the question of feeding youths such as Dr. Guthrie was at the time of his college career, we should be inclined to think that stinting them was almost worse than pampering, in respect of making them think too much about eating and drinking.

Throughout the whole of his college and school training, according to his autobiography, Dr. Guthrie's worst faults seem to have been an exuberance of that spirit of fun and that energy of character which was in after life turned to such good account; and we must remember, that as he himself remarks, he was a mere boy, pushed on too fast at school, and sent too early to the University. This was unfortunate for him, for another reason: *i.e.*, that he had finished his whole course of eight years,—four at the literary and philosophic classes, and four as a student of theology,—two years before he could be taken on trial for license as a probationer; and after that time, five years elapsed before he obtained a vacant benefice. He was licensed to the presbytery of Brechin in 1825; and as is usual on these occasions, was required to preach what is called the trial sermon. He read his discourse on that occasion, but resolved never to do so again; and here he takes the opportunity of censuring the habit of reading sermons, instead of preaching without book. On this question much may be said. What is right for one man, may not be admissable for another; and a good written sermon is

Digitized by Google

better than a bad extempore one. But unquestionably a sermon delivered without book, is, *cæteris paribus*, more effective than one which is read. In respect of the habit, too prevalent in England at this present day, of preaching other men's sermons, we fully agree with Dr. Guthrie in his objection to it: if there be no other reason against it, it is dishonest. Some say it is pretty well understood that this is the practice: why, then, if they do not think there is anything to conceal, do they not take a printed book into the pulpit?

Through his father's interest, Guthrie was not long in obtaining a presentation to a large parish with a good income, which however he lost through the intervention of what was then called the Moderate party, because he was unwilling to pledge himself to them. Of course the loss was a great disappointment for the time being, but it eventually worked for his good, by enabling him to grow yet riper for a ministerial charge. His studies during the five years which intervened, part of which time was spent in Paris, were not confined entirely to theological subjects, but they were at least as usefully employed in gaining knowledge of the world, and also in acquiring an acquaintance with the medical art, which is always useful to a pastor, not only because it enables him to relieve pain, but also because it gives him an additional influence over his flock. At all events, though the long silence to which he was condemned was naturally regarded as a misfortune at the time, yet it is a sort of training to which those destined to perform great things have been generally subjected. Witness the case of Moses, of St. Paul, and above all, of our blessed Lord. During part of the five years before his appointment to a parish, Guthrie obtained a situation in a bank in which his family had been shareholders, filling up a vacancy caused by his brother's death; and his work here he regards as having been advantageous to him, because it caused his parishioners to feel, as he says, "that their minister was something more than a fine body who knew no more about the trials and temptations of men engaged in the business of the world, than an old wife or the man in the moon."

At length he was appointed to the parish of Arbilot, not, however, without some opposition from the Moderates. His life here, as he describes it, was full of those ups and downs which every earnest minister must experience in dealing with souls, but these are delightfully interspersed with humorous anecdotes, hardly important enough to be quoted here, where our space is so limited, but which add greatly to the interest of the narrative. In the parish of Arbilot he gave abundant promise of that future popularity which he was to obtain as a preacher and a man in Edinburgh. Dr. M'Cock's reminiscences of him (p. 321, vol. i.)

Digitized by Google

give strong testimony to this, as also those of Mr. Dish, a former parishioner. The latter remarks:—

"Mr. Guthrie's future popularity as a preacher was indicated at the very outset. I recollect the first text he preached from at Arbilot (Thess. v. 33): 'And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly.' I was too young to recollect much of the sermon, but I remember this, the name of Christ appeared as it were ringing in my ears. It was the golden thread that bound all the sermon together." (P. 323, vol. i.)

Surely, this is an exact description (as far as it goes) of what a sermon ought to be. It is not, as some people seem to think, by mentioning the name of Jesus as often as possible, that we really preach Him, nor is it by saying a great deal about Him, but by making Him the corner stone of our sermons, as He is of His Church. But, in order to effect this, the preacher's mind and heart should be imbued with Christ. In 1830 Mr. Guthrie was married to Anne, the eldest daughter of the Rev. James Burns, of Brechin: he was betrothed to her several years. His marriage was a happy one. The account of his residence at Arbilot gives an idea of great felicity. He thoroughly realized the pastoral character, which it is more easy to do in the country than in town, but which in any place requires certain qualifications, both in the pastor and the flock. In England it depends very much on the county where a clergyman resides; whether the same be the case in Scotland we cannot say, but everywhere it must depend in a great measure on the minister also. In Mr. Guthrie's case, his sympathetic nature, his great benevolence, and his information on so many secular matters in which he was able to help his flock, were a great assistance in establishing that fatherly relation, which it is so delightful to see subsisting between a pastor and his flock, and which is implied in the very word pastor. Towards the close of his residence at Arbilot, the knowledge of medicine acquired at Paris, must have been of great assistance, for about that time the typhus fever and the influenza broke out: the latter assuming an unusually virulent form. Mr. Guthrie himself suffered, and was very near dying, but, in answer to fervent prayers, was raised up again and restored to his duties. There is one suggestion which he makes for avoiding infection, which we will quote, for it is worth acting upon, as it may prove useful, and cannot be injurious. When speaking of his fearlessness of infection which some great and good men are haunted by, he adds, "At the same time while I felt it my duty to expose my life as much as a soldier, when I was called to do so, I always, wherever it was possible, made the door be left open, and stood between it and the bed: not between the bed and the fireplace." (P. 147, vol. i.)

Digitized by Google

In 1837 he was inducted into Grey Friars' Church, in Edinburgh. Here he had to witness a great deal of poverty and degradation, but he never shrunk from encountering it, and in order thus to be nearer his people, and exercise influence over them, he chose his residence among them; his opinions on the duty of acting thus are very strong (see p. 370, vol. i.), and are well worth considering. The history of his difference with Lord Medwin, with which the 1st vol. closes, and the way in which he won him over by acts of kindness, teaches us a useful lesson as to how to dissolve an enmity. The 2nd vol. we must only glance at, for besides the fact that our space is limited, a great part of that volume records the history of the Disruption, an event which though it occasioned in Scotland more interest and excitement than almost any other event which has happened in that country, is viewed with comparative indifference in England. Mr. Guthrie was one of the leaders in this movement, and most bravely he fought his way through difficulties, with that lion-like courage which was so much his characteristic. The evil of that great split in the Church of Scotland was necessary. In fact, the whole question is one of those which we may be allowed to prejudge. For the mere fact that the best and wisest of the Presbyterian ministers thought it necessary to sacrifice their manses and stipends, and to go forth supported only by a vague hope of future sustenance, leaving everything in short for the cause of the Gospel, is alone a sufficient proof that they must have had an urgent reason for making such a movement. When a single individual sacrifices much for conscience sake, we may esteem him as a man, but we have no reason to suppose that his course of conduct is necessarily a wise one: but when the best part of a Church find it advisable to secede, the case is very different. Not that the reasons which some of the seceders gave, Dr. Guthrie among others, were all of them cogent. He seems to think that it was a question, which hinged upon whether they made Christ or the secular Courts the head of the Church. Whereas, in reality, Christ can only be the head of the invisible Church. He is not the head of any earthly sect or party, and we rather wonder that the liberality of Dr. Guthrie's mind did not enable him to see this. His last letter to Dean Ramsey shows, as, indeed, the greater part of his life does, what his views were on the subject of sects.

"How perfect the harmony in our views as to the petty distinctions around us, where sad and shame to think of it, such fierce controversies have raged. I thank God that I, like yourself, have not attached much importance to these externals, and have had the fortune to be considered rather loose on such matters. We have, by

Digitized by Google

God's grace, anticipated the views and aspects which present themselves on a death-bed." (P. 472, vol. 2.)

Now, certainly, if Christ were the head of any visible Church, we could not suppose that it was a matter of minor importance whether we joined that Church or not. But our own idea is that the view we have just been combating was an after-thought, and that what really caused the explosion was the gross abuse of lay patronage, which was carried to such an extent that it threatened the utter destruction of the established Church of Scotland.

The latter part of this biography we shall not dwell upon. It consists of an account of his various travels, his many acts of usefulness, not the least of which was the establishment of the ragged schools in Edinburgh. We have already noticed that if there was any one class of beings towards whom Dr. Guthrie's benevolence was exhibited more than another, it was towards children. We have heard that he could never pass a child crying in the streets without telling its nurse to be kind to it. Certainly, though the love of children is found in many who are not of an exalted nature, yet this disposition is required to make up the complement in a great and noble character. Indeed, such characters often show a fondness for children, and a predilection for their society, partly because they have something child-like in their own dispositions. Dr. Guthrie's domestic life was a delightful one, and the terms on which he stood with his children most happy, and his management of them wise; taking interest in all their harmless amusements, and treating them neither with over strictness nor unwise indulgence, so that we felt sure, even before we saw the fact stated in his memoir, that they must all of them have done him credit, or, at least, not disgraced him.

It is a melancholy truth that the children of many excellent parents turn out ill; but when this is the case, it is almost always to be traced to some fault in their education, and though the erring ones are very often finally brought within the fold of Christ through the prayers of their parents, still the intervening time is one of great sorrow to all who are interested in their welfare. Mr. Guthrie received the degree of D.D. on his return to the pulpit, which he had been obliged to abandon for some years, owing to ill health. The account of his travels, given in his own letters at this time, is very interesting. His journeys on the Continent often had an especial object in them. The cause of the Waldenses he espoused with great zeal, and penetrated further into their country than most travellers. He gives a curious account of their mode of living in these wild parts. His name will ever be associated with that of General Beckwith and Dr. Gilby, for the zeal with which he espoused their cause.

In 1864 Dr. Guthrie was under the necessity of giving up

Digitized by Google

preaching entirely, owing to the action of his heart, which as the doctors told him, was such as might cause him any day to drop down dead in the pulpit. His letter to his parishioners on this occasion is beautiful and affecting. (P. 409, vol. ii.) He did not however remain idle, but in addition to other occupations, undertook the management of the *Sunday Magazine*. It has been said that the articles in this periodical were not always as sound as they ought to have been; but it must be remembered that though he was not at the time of his Editorship a very old man, yet he was beginning to break up, and moreover had other work on hand to take up his time. It is a pity, however, that under these circumstances he undertook so arduous a duty. His gradual decline was slow and tedious, owing to the strength of his constitution, which battled long with the disease. He had therefore much to endure, though sustained by faith and comforted by the Christian sympathy of friends. But in answer to his prayer that his death might not be made subject to any distressing circumstances, his latter end was quiet and beautiful, —one instance among many that the evils we most dread, if earnestly prayed against, are generally in mercy withheld.

Such, then, was the life, and such the death of one of the noblest and most loveable men that Scotland, and we may almost add, the world, ever produced. His character was singularly calculated to win the affections of all who came in contact with him, especially his own countrymen. To them he will be among Christian ministers what Burns was among poets. Not that his intellect was quite of the highest order: he was little of a theologian, nor was he a deep thinker; nor did he possess much of the power of analysis. His mind was essentially objective rather than subjective, concrete rather than abstract; and like most objective minds, he was unwilling to speak of his inward emotions, and this may be one reason why he makes no mention of the time when his conversion took place. Perhaps, from his peculiar constitution of mind, he was not himself aware of it. The same disposition may perhaps also account for what we have heard stated as a fact, and which we can readily believe,—that he was more effective in the conversion of sinners than in the building up of believers. His writings, as far as we know of them, treat chiefly of the elementary parts of religion. He delights to dwell on the freedom from bondage which the Gospel offers us, and he speaks on this subject with a heartfelt joy, which must recommend itself to the hearts of his readers. As regards the character of his intellect, we should say that its strong points were great powers of observation combined with an accurate memory, both of which he brought wonderfully to bear on the truths of religion. The

Digitized by Google

earth and all its beauties were to him a mirror, in which the Almighty's form was reflected; and this, combined with his great powers of illustration, was what gave the charm to his preaching. He had moreover the poetical as well as the humorous vein very strongly developed in him. The former of these seems to us not to have been sufficiently chastened by a correct taste. We only once heard him preach, and have not read much of his writings, but the impression left on our minds was that he was too florid; and if it had been any other man, we should have called his style an ambitious one; but we have been assured, what his simple unostentatious character would warrant us in supposing, that this style was natural to him. Still it is not a style which ought to be held up as a model to young preachers. His whole life was one eminently calculated to inspire any one, especially young people, with a cheerful and happy view of Christianity. Perhaps that objectiveness of mind which we before noticed contributed to this, for men of his stamp are generally more light-hearted than those of the opposite type. At all events he was, happily for himself and for the interests of that Gospel which he so faithfully preached, a man devoid of that morbid monkish spirit which characterizes some true Christians who refuse to enjoy God's gifts. In this one respect he reminds us of Dr. Arnold, to whom in most points he was very dissimilar. He enjoyed life as a traveller hastening forward to a happy home, a better country; and who though keenly alive to the beauties of the surrounding scenery, never steps out of the right path, either to gather a flower, to look at a prospect, or to avoid a rough road. Moreover, he was (if we may be allowed to use the expression) Broad Church, in a favourable sense of the term. He possessed the good which exists in Broad Churchmen, without those faults to which they owe their name. He did not, like them, try to widen the strait gate, but on the other hand, he never sought to narrow it, by making too much of non-essentials.

Such, then, was Dr. Guthrie. Well may we say of him, that though dead, he yet speaketh; and reasonably may we hope that the work he has done, as well as the name he has left behind, will never perish, even in this world.

THE PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTION OF THE CLERGY.

To the paper in our last number, headed "The Establishment of an Institution for the Theological Preparation of the Clergy," we now proceed to add the following general remarks.

Digitized by Google

Such Instruction is Proper and in Order.

Long ago society refused to be left to the mercy of untrained medical practitioners. Recently the instinct of self-preservation has moved it to extend the range of its anxieties, and to exact of others offering to serve it in a public capacity some recognised guarantee of fitness. No one is permitted to practise as a solicitor, or to occupy a post in one of our public offices, or to be placed in the army or navy as an officer, without a previous examination as an attestation of competency. But for those who aspire to the office of a teacher in the Church of God established in this country no adequate professional instruction is provided, and to no sufficient test of fitness are they subjected. The Dissenting bodies have institutions for the instruction of their respective religious teachers. The Church of Rome discovered the consequences of negligence in this respect at the Reformation. Taught and assisted by the Jesuits, she reformed her practice. For long she has been, and now is, most careful to have her agents thoroughly instructed in the duties of their respective offices. To this prudent vigilance she is indebted for the external uniformity of the teaching and action of her clergy. Our deficiency in the same respect is obviously an anomaly: strange that the laity should submit to it so patiently.

A Continuance of the Clergy in Professional Ignorance is Perilous.

Once the community at large were indifferent to the subject of religion, and the majority of the clergy were inert. The negative antagonism of stagnation was the chief difficulty with which the Evangelical clergyman,—the living element in Church ministration,—had to contend. Against this he deemed himself sufficiently equipped, and, for the discharge of his spiritual vocation in general, sufficiently prepared, by a private study of Scripture after the date of his conversion. Now that a large proportion of the clergy are no longer inert; now that religion is a subject of interest, more or less generally; now that almost every variety of opinion, from the most superficial to the most profound, and well nigh every diversity of worship, from the most puerile to the most spiritual exercise, is either agitated or on the verge of agitation; now, in short, that society and the Church at large are thus alive to religion, and active, the clerical ignorance, tolerable in a state of stagnation, is manifestly perilous, is almost certain to issue in disaster.

The present condition of the Church is a state of division which is ruinous and well nigh hopeless. To the apprehension of the late Prime Minister (*The Contemporary Review*) there is

Digitized by Google

no alternative but disruption and disestablishment, as the one course; or, as the other, the submission of our reformed and Protestant Church to the innovations already achieved by the party who have turned their faces towards Rome, and are held by the nation to have adopted some of her specific errors, and to be devoted to their implantation and propagation in the country. The latter alternative is to be regarded as altogether impracticable. Disruption, therefore, and Disestablishment are the destiny foreseen and foretold by Mr. Gladstone. It would require some considerable time and space to attempt to point out how far we are indebted for this deplorable condition to the professional ignorance of the clergy. But disruption and disestablishment, however disastrous, are not the worst of the perils with which we are now menaced. The present estimate and credit, still high, of the Word of God, of the essential doctrines of the Gospel, and of the Church as a witness for Christ in this country, are threatened. The question by far the most urgent is not precisely that mooted by our distinguished Statesman: "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" but, "Is the religion of Christ, as a national possession, worth preservation; and is it possible for the Church of England, established or disestablished, in union or in disruption, to operate for such an end as it ought, with a clergy who, through professional ignorance, are disabled and incompetent to meet the exigencies of their function?" A danger, painful even to glance at, shows itself on the horizon of the prospect. With the increase of activity in religion will not religious questions emerge with augmented frequency,—questions various and difficult of satisfactory solution,—and will they not put the clergy more and more to a test which can but serve to make the incompetence of the ignorant more and more flagrantly manifest? And may not contempt for the clerical profession be at length the deplorable issue? In the midst of increased confusion in the Church, and of further divisions, and in the absence of proper spiritual cultivation, the profession of a clergyman may forfeit its present position of esteem and respect!

His will not be the social degradation which a carnal community awards unrighteously to a witness faithful in the discharge of a Divine and spiritual commission, but that which is due to those who profess to undertake such a function, and show themselves incompetent, through an unjustifiable ignorance of the doctrines committed to their inculcation. Is it not the part of prudence in those who appreciate the Word of God, and the doctrines of the Gospel evolved at the Reformation, and the Church of the Reformation, to give due weight to these considerations, and to make some provision against a development so possible and so menacing?

Digitized by Google

What is the specific type of the Professional Instruction which is required?

It must be such as shall enable the teacher to publish a salvation which is distinguished by three features,—Divine authority, adaptation to the wants and condition of man, and present accessibility, efficiency and sufficiency. The Gospel professes to be the power of God unto Salvation, to every one that believeth,—unto a salvation effectual, and adequate, which is accessible now in part,—and that a part, which is not simply an initiation of what is hereafter to be perfected, but a preparation for what is to come, and a preparation of such a character, that being possessed, we see and hold in it a pledge and guarantee of what is yet to follow. No manifestation of Christianity which fails in one of those features will suffice to present it as it is, and secure for it the victory proper to it, in the presence and conflict of all that superstition may concoct, or the audacity of scepticism may advance, or the evolutions of the future may bring forth.

It follows that a knowledge of the doctrines of Christ, with regard to personal salvation, is the specific instruction of one whose professional vocation is to publish salvation, to invite sinners to receive it, and to assist them in their efforts. He should possess it, not only precisely as the Word of God presents it, that it may have Divine authority, but in such a sense and form that he shall be able to apply it practically to those entrusted to his pastoral charge, so soon as he shall enter on it, and encounter, as he must, the necessitous sinner at any stage of his spiritual malady. The instant he enters on the practice of his profession, the surgeon may have to amputate, or the physician to prescribe for disease, and must not his professional instruction be such as to qualify him for this instant practice of what he knows? That the clergyman may be equally able, ready, and expert in the ministration of salvation in all the requisite features just enumerated,—that is of a salvation adapted to the very wants and condition of those to whom he ministers, and so presented to them as to be accessible, and efficient, and sufficient, as an instrumentality whereby the spirit of life in Christ Jesus may operate,—he must be well instructed in Scripture. Scriptural instruction, therefore, in the doctrines of Christ with regard to the personal salvation of man, is the specific preparation for the clerical office, and must be placed first in the programme of an Institution established for the professional instruction of the clergy.

This instruction, however, he should hold in the state and form proper to him who has to impart it to others professionally.

Digitized by Google

The Amateur studies physiology or anatomy in those branches only for which he has a taste or fancy: a Surgeon makes the whole structure and composition of the human body the subject of his inquiry and knowledge. Fragments, therefore, of the science are generally all that the former acquires: but the latter grasps the whole, and knows each part, not only in itself, but in its relations and action in connection with the rest,—the particular functions of each of the organs, with their mutual influence and joint results. Now, the fragmentary knowledge of the amateur is a type of the religious knowledge of the layman in the Church. Generally, he learns only what the necessities of his personal salvation may demand; though, if he would be perfect, he should count the whole revealed Word of God an expedient and obligatory object of study. The comprehensive and interconnected knowledge of the surgeon typifies the specific character of the clergyman's views of the doctrine of salvation. In his mind not one of the details of that doctrine should stand by itself, but always in its particular relations and dependencies. Not for this special want of the sinner, or for that, is he to be prepared, but for the whole round of human necessity. Hence his knowledge is to be distinguished from that common to the layman, not only by a certain perfection in detail proper to a practical communicator of knowledge, but by the connectedness of its details, and by its comprehensiveness, and completeness. Marked, then, by this characteristic, must be the preparatory instruction imparted to a candidate for the sacred ministry. His conception of salvation, however far from perfection it may be, is to be of this type. He, too, like the surgeon, as he progresses in practice and experience, will have to correct and alter—to excise here, to add there, to prune in some parts, and everywhere to improve, as he himself grows and ripens in Scriptural knowledge, and in spiritual experience, and in his apprehension of man, natural and spiritual. But, from the beginning, if possible, he should be accurate in the cardinal details, and in the general outline of God's method of saving man. His future progress should comprise, not the acquisition of that which is primary, but of that which is secondary,—not the correction of an outline, but simply its filling up,—with an ever-deepening realization of what in form he has known from the beginning.

To this knowledge of God's method of salvation, which is indispensable to a teacher in the Church, and therefore, ever to be placed first, Theology, in its popular meaning, is to be added. This includes the settlements of the Reformation: namely, the Articles and the Prayer-book, also the Canons and Ecclesiastical Law, so far as they may be relevant and requisite, with the products of Divines nurtured in the Reformed Church of

Digitized by Google

England, thoroughly loyal in their character and career, and accepted as sound and faithful expounders of her specific views and principles, and of what is cognate and in harmony with them. Nothing which is specifically distinctive of the Church of England with regard to doctrine, worship, practice, and government, should be left out, that the professional instruction actually provided may be adapted, and suffice for all who may wish to serve in her clerically, with fidelity and cordiality. No ensign of a party, nor any requirement, nor any exclusiveness of spirit, not due to the specific character, genius, and constituent principles of the English Church of the Reformation, should exist to alarm, discourage, or exclude any one of her loyal members. A knowledge of Church History should be added, especially of those departments which exhibit, in their origin and expansion, the peculiarities of the Church of Rome,—one monster antagonist of our future contentions,—and the principles lying at the foundation of Ritualism,—now Rome's active and persistent purveyor, unconsciously or otherwise. Whatever is essential in the nature and composition of man, contemplated as a moral and religious and yet a physical being, that is, moral philosophy and psychology, should not be omitted. The evidences of natural and revealed religion should be included of course, with the most prominent and prevailing objections,—those naturally involved in the substance, or form, or revelation of the positive and existing religion of God, as well as those invented by the perverse and persistent activity and ingenuity of scepticism. Scripture, as presented in its Hebrew and Greek originals, should ever be employed in the instruction of those intended to be instructors themselves, and dealt with critically, that habits of exact observation and inquiry, and habits of analyzing, defining, and comparing, and in short, of criticism at large, may be cultivated.

It is obvious that what is required at present is not proficiency in any system of Divinity, such as the scholastic tendency surviving the middle ages, and the necessities of the post-Reformation age may have prompted the Calvinist or the Lutheran to elaborate, but a knowledge of the contents of Divine Revelation. These contents fairly and fully ascertained, clearly and definitely conceived, and adjusted properly the one to the other, in their specific and practical relationships, so that they may be held precisely as Scripture reveals them,—held on its authority, and not as that of any Church, or of any system of divinity, however sound and reputable, or of any scholar, however eminent; and held in such form that they may be applied as they are held, by the religious teacher, to the members of his flock for the purpose of salvation, will no doubt constitute

Digitized by Google

a *Theology*. This theology will not unduly narrow the mind of the taught: on the contrary it will enlarge it. It will not enfeeble and enslave it to a cold and dried system of theological speculation, but invigorate it by the light of God, that strengthens while it illuminates,—and emancipate it, giving all the freedom which is consistent with submission to the revealed Word of God. This, indeed, will be the propitious issue only when, with the human instructor, the grace of God co-operates. But the presence and activity of this indispensable auxiliary is to be assumed,—assumed through faith,—wherever the Scriptures are faithfully taught by one who himself is a believer; and must be assumed whether the persons under instruction be an ordinary congregation, or a class in a theological institution. In neither case is the possibility of its absence to restrain the teacher from an exact and full statement of Divine thoughts and Divine injunctions, though the one will not be accurately understood, nor the other thoroughly felt, by those in whom it is positively absent or inactive.

The Locality of the proposed Theological Institution.

If impracticable at one of the Universities, it might be located at any place where the site is central, and with suitable surroundings and conveniences.

If it were established at an University, say Cambridge, the lectures of the University Professors of Divinity, and the University Library would be accessible to the students; opportunities also for acquiring divers languages would be offered to those of them who might aspire to the office of missionary to the heathen. From its presence and the consequent effects, the University itself might derive no small advantage. The students would supply each of the Professors of Divinity, if he were orthodox, with a class constant in attendance, interested in his treatment of whatever subject he might be dealing with, qualified to follow him lecture after lecture, during each term, and to derive profitable and appreciated instruction. Perceiving that what they taught was understood, remembered, and digested, by persons about to make actual use of it in their function as teachers, the Professors could not but realize the serious importance of themselves as *prime factors* in the religious instruction of the country. A higher value would they set on their work, a deeper interest would they take in it; and consequently they would cultivate Divinity more thoroughly and more practically. When students in divinity from all Europe crowded to the Sorbonne, at Paris, that study was high in estimation, and great was the dignity and exultation of its Professors. Were Cambridge to become

Digitized by Google

the seat of a School of Divinity, where a large proportion of the clergy of this great country and her colonies found their professional equipment, the office of a Professor in Divinity, and the Science it serves, might undergo a joint resurrection, in which the occupants of the office would find a sacred and profound satisfaction.

The advantages which the introduction of a School of Divinity, with its appropriate teachers and pupils, and the revival of Divinity as a science, would be to the University itself, is most obvious. Cambridge, as well as Oxford, seems to be threatened with a total immersion in secularism, and with a consequent corruption, of which the progeny is likely to be monstrous, disgraceful, and ruinous to the country. The presence and influence of students in preparation for holy orders might operate as a salt, potent to restrain the foul immorality begotten of the secular spirit, to check the presumption and audacity of scepticism, and to create and preserve a moral and mental atmosphere so wholesome that the students of every branch of learning might be invigorated. In the issue, the University itself might so prosper in the purpose for which it exists, and grow in reputation, that even in this age, bold, changeful, and subversive as it is, Cambridge might confirm its ancient and august position and office, as one of the chief organs of the higher education of the Empire.

The Special Scheme.

The parties, for whose instruction the contemplated Institution is intended, are those *who have taken a Degree in one of the Universities, or are actually proceeding to do so, and are destined for the sacred ministry in the Church of England.* For others intending to be ordained a Theological Institution is already in existence,—St. John's College, Highbury,—conducted on sound principles, with much ability and with so great success, under its able principal Dr. Boultbee.

(1) If established at Cambridge it might be an University Hall composed of two departments.

The *first* of these might be, in constitution, much the same as one of the existing Halls, or as Keble's Hall at Oxford, where any one intending to take a degree, whether he meant to be ordained eventually or no, might enter, reside, and proceed to it, as in other Colleges. This would meet the want of parents anxious with regard to the faith, piety, and morality of their sons, and distrustful of the moral and religious atmosphere prevalent in the University at large.

The *second* department would be the *Theological Institution.* Primarily this would be provided for the instruction of members of the other compartment who had taken their degrees, or were in

Digitized by Google

preparation for so doing, and wished to pass through a course of Theology with a view to Ordination; *but to them it would not be confined.* It would be accessible to all who had matriculated in the University, of whatever College, or of whatsoever University standing they might be. Thus it would be invested with a *general* character; and as the instruction which it provided would be simply that which every clergyman faithful to the principles of the Reformation, and to whatever is distinctive of the Church of England, ought to know, hold, and teach, it might gain the confidence of many who were desirous of a substantial preparation for Orders; and thankfully might they subscribe themselves students, and pass through the course of theological instruction in submission to the imposed regulations.

It is difficult to see how, in the existence and operation of such a compartment, there could be features discordant with any principle or practice of the University. The position, dignity, or office of the University Divinity Professors would not suffer. They could but gain, if the Professors themselves were faithful to the Church and her characteristics.

(2) But the *whole* Institution might be confined to *Theology*, with the consent of the University. In that case a smaller provision of buildings would suffice, at the commencement of its career; and the funds, then requisite, would be proportionally less.

(3) If the Institution were located anywhere but at an University, it might be established at once by the provision of suitable buildings, and a proper staff of teachers. The expense of a minimum provision to meet its wants, at its institution, would not necessarily be very large.

Is the Establishment of such an Institution practicable?

It is obviously so, either in an University town or elsewhere, if the requisite funds can be raised. These will have to be provided chiefly by *Laymen.* Of the disposition and zeal of that portion of the community, with regard to such a project, there is small room for doubt, *at the present crisis in the Church*, seeing that in Her pastoral soundness and sufficiency *their families are immediately and profoundly interested.* When instructed, recommended, and urged by clergymen, in whose doctrines, piety, and judgment they confide, the Laity are generally found eventually to give a sufficient support to whatever deserves it. Let the *Clergy*, then, take the proposed project into serious consideration, and give it their warm, intelligent, and earnest support; and if it be within the compass of His designs with regard to the Church of this great and highly favoured country, God will make

Digitized by Google

use of their instrumentality to supply a serious defect in its machinery, and thereby, in some measure, to heal the disorders which exist, and to neutralize those which are anticipated. Chiefly, therefore, with the *responsibility* created by this appeal, are the *Clergy invested*, and especially the Evangelical clergy, who have the capacity of acting in concert. If the influence of the Clergy at present be indefinitely great, and the wealth of the Laity available for such a project be large,—larger than at any previous era,—and the crisis we have reached be admittedly momentous, while the project is of incalculable value with regard to the moral and religious welfare of the nation, to the preservation and prosperity of the Church, and, in short, to the salvation of man and to the glory of God,—surely no one, whether clerical or lay, should be *indifferent*. Self-interest conspires with the nobler impulses of the patriot and the Christian to require an earnest consideration of the project; and on its approval, a readiness to countenance and support its promoters.

"FORGERY THE BASIS OF THE PAPAL POWER."

WHEN we stand before an oak in the full majesty of its perfected strength, it is difficult to carry the mind back to the acorn which once contained, and yet in no wise indicated, so great a promise. Many empires and mighty institutions now impose on our imagination by their vastness, their apparent stability, and their far-reaching antiquity, which, if traced back to their origin, have the meanest beginnings and the most rudimentary organizations.

The Papacy is one of the most imposing of all existing constitutions. Certainly it is the most audacious and most unlimited in its claims on human allegiance. Whence its origin? Was it divine or human, or of mixed descent? It is the strangest history to follow, as the thing itself is the strangest phenomenon in all human history. Its first utterance is a feeble claim of an early Roman Bishop for a trifling jurisdiction, which was at once repudiated, and himself rebuked. Or again, it was a position of precedence and honour given to the Bishop of the Imperial City when the Episcopate of the Roman Empire assembled in Council. What its last utterance or its last claim has been we need not say: but every step which has led from the first to the last development has been of the earth earthy. Human superstition, human ignorance, human fraud and forgery,—then human learning and philosophy to systematize the deceit and make sure the ground so far gained,—this is the history of the Papacy.

Digitized by Google

If we attempt now to give a slight account of a few of the forgeries upon which the vast fabric of the Papacy was reared, it is not because the story is new, unknown, or doubted; it is not that any Papal advocate dare uphold them in any seat of learning in Europe, but because we are aware how little these pages of history are turned by Protestant hands, and how unknown the story is to most of those whom it most deeply concerns.

We shall take the year A.D. 800 as the central point of time to which attention is desired: within half a century before or after that year the transactions occurred which shall be briefly related. But first we may consider the character of the epoch in European history represented by that date. The Roman Empire had then been for about 400 years in the crucible, slowly dissolving and crystallizing anew into fresh forms out of the decomposed mass. To the ordinary reader the history of those 400 years before A.D. 800 is simply chaos. Saxons, Goths, Franks, Vandals, Lombards, Saracens, and other more uncouth names flit before the mind: it is the incursion of the barbarians and nothing more. Just before the year A.D. 400 there was still the grand old Roman Empire, Christianized at last, spreading from the Frith of Forth to the Desert of Sahara,—from the Atlantic to the Euphrates. Then came the inrush of Teuton and Saracen, and to the ordinary gaze it is a fog, and little more, for about 400 years: the Empire is blotted out, blank confusion takes its place. Then the fog slowly lifts, and where the Roman Empire had been, the outlines of something like modern Europe become dimly discernible. Our date of A.D. 800 may be regarded as marking such an epoch as this. Two or three words will illustrate our assertion. In that year Charlemagne was crowned Emperor of the West: with him come into view the rudiments of the subsequent European system. Germany enters upon its chequered career; France, Italy, and the Netherlands thence-forward run their destined course. On the other side of the Pyrenees the kingdom of Navarre had been founded, and Spain had fairly entered upon the long struggle with the Moors, from which it emerged victorious. Lastly, about this time, Egbert, who had been trained in arms and policy under Charlemagne, became King of Wessex. It may not be strictly accurate that he was sole Monarch of England, yet from his accession undoubtedly the English monarchy takes its rise, and England enters upon its course as a power in Europe. These few historic notes may serve to emphasize this year A.D. 800, as marking the epoch when the fog of 400 years, which had blotted out the Roman Empire, is fairly lifting, and Europe, with its complicated relations, comes forth into view.

Digitized by Google

Through all the convulsions of those four turbulent centuries at which we have glanced, the great city of Rome stood in almost unscathed grandeur. It had been sacked, indeed, more than once, but otherwise, though with scantier population, it stood comparatively untouched. It was the hand of mediæval builders and ravagers that lay so heavily on its ancient buildings, and reduced them to what we see now. And through those centuries that city, abandoned by the Emperors, was sitting watchful, and retained no small portion of its ancient prestige. Though the Empire was gone, the provincial of Gaul, or of Italy still looked to it as the centre of law, and its name was still mighty among the barbarous invaders. And in all the city there was no man above its Bishop. He was elected to his office by the whole Roman people, and they gradually learned to look up to him as their acknowledged head. Whether for law, for learning, or religion, the Saxon, the Frank, and the German resorting to Rome as the centre of all these, and the ancient mistress of the world, found the great Roman Bishop supreme, and they returned with vague notions of a supremacy whose limits no man clearly knew, and which they were generally not much disposed to question. Somewhat in this position, as well as brevity of description may serve, stood the Papacy about the epoch which has been chosen. It was a position full of promise for the most soaring ambition, putting forth already the widest claims to allegiance, but destitute of the smallest basis for such claims in those first four centuries of Christianity, within which, if a doctrine or an institution cannot be traced, it must be stamped at once as novel and human, even if it be not also corrupt and evil.

But the emergent Europe of which we have spoken was beginning to read, to think, and inquire. Bede, Alcuin, and other venerable names will sufficiently mark this. Mere claims without a basis would not support the fabric of power over the West, which the Bishops of Rome were now striving to consolidate. If no documents could be found which would trace the existence of such a power into those first four centuries, documents must be fabricated. If there was no decree of ancient Council, no rescript of Emperor, no utterance of primitive Roman Bishop that recognized Papal power, these must be forged. And they were forged. And thenceforward the Bishop of Rome unhesitatingly claimed unlimited power over the whole domain of conscience; over doctrine, as well as discipline, wherever a Christian, of whatever rank or degree, could act, or think, or reason. And yet the basis of all this was forgery, so unquestionable, that the late Dean Milman says in his "Latin Christianity," there can now be heard for it "hardly a murmur of defence." But

Digitized by Google

none considered nor said, "Is there not a lie in my right hand?"

To speak more particularly. Somewhat less than fifty years before our central date of A.D. 800, as the learned Dollinger takes to be proved, there was produced in Rome a document purporting to be a donation from the Emperor Constantine, who had then been dead more than 400 years. It was founded on an earlier legend, which contradicts all history, that Constantine had been healed of leprosy, and baptized by Silvester. This earlier legend fought for its life with more vigour than some of its brethren in the 16th century. Baronius and Reginald Pole strove hard to save it, but history was too powerful for all their efforts: yet it survives in Rome. An inscription on an obelisk before the church of St. John Lateran, still asserts that there the great Emperor was baptized by Silvester; and still the marvelling visitor is told, and, no doubt, often believes, that in the adjacent baptistery the sacred rite was performed. In gratitude for this, the donation professed to confer vast privileges on the Church of Rome. Modern Romanists are not very fond of this document: not only because of the discredit arising from an unquestionable forgery, which was adopted by several infallible Pontiffs, but, because the rights which they now say are inherent in the successor of Peter, were claimed by this eighth century document, as having been voluntarily conferred by an Emperor.

Many of the legendary histories seem to have owed their birth to the mere wantonness of imagination. Fiction in all ages has been the delight of the human mind. In our time it takes the form of the novel; in the dark ages it ran riot in legendary stories. But the more methodical documentary fictions sprang from crafty politic brains. In the eighth century the long contest in Italy between the Greek Emperors and the Lombards was turning in favour of the latter, and the Pope in his horror of Lombard barbarism threw himself into the arms of the Franks. But the idea had probably been for some time at work in subtle Roman minds. Could not Rome, with the Pope at its head, be constituted once more mistress of Italy? Might not Greek and Lombard alike be set aside; and, allied with the warlike Franks, might not the Pope reign over a united Italy? The idea in itself was neither unpatriotic nor unpromising for the future of civilization in the Europe of that age. And before the strong grasp of Pepin and Charlemagne closed on the peninsula that grip which through all modifications has never been loosened until our own epoch, it might seem not otherwise than feasible. Accordingly a basis was diligently prepared for such a political arrangement as Rome desired. The title of the Popes

Digitized by Google

to such a sovereignty was traced back more than 400 years, by the audacious forger who produced from inscrutable archives the famous Donation of Constantine. In what school these forgers were taught, or how their race was perpetuated, who shall precisely say? But the student of history knows that ancient documents are honey-combed by their strange burrowing for many a century. Abbeys were continually claiming lands or privileges on the strength of false charters; and in State affairs diplomacy met apocryphal history with newly forged recitals. So, for example, out of the claims of England upon Scotland made under the Edwards, grew up on the one side a baseless history of ancient vassalage; and on the other, that marvellous chronicle of early Scottish Empire, traced from Grecian princes, which is even yet embodied in the long array of fantastic portraits placed by the seventh James in the gallery of Holyrood.

But we must return to the ambitious document before us. If we summarize its chief items, we may thus briefly represent its contents.

Constantine promotes the chair of Peter over the Empire. He confers on it Imperial power and honour, and grants the use of Imperial robes and insignia. He gives the Roman clergy the rank and privileges of Nobles. He makes the Bishops of Rome judges in all that concerns the service of God and the Christian faith, and grants them supreme authority over all the Churches in the world. Lastly, he gives the sovereignty over Rome, Italy or the western regions, to the Pope. This last clause subsequent Popes generally read with *and*, instead of *or*.

Such are the contents of this famous forgery. It is the basis not only of that temporal power of which the Popes have only just been deprived, but of many of their mediæval claims, and in particular of that which links in these brief historical gleanings with the subsequent fortunes of England.

When Henry II., King of England, desired some show of legality for his invasion of Ireland, Pope Hadrian IV., the only Englishman who has sat in the Papal chair, readily conferred upon him the dominion of that country; for by this time the Popes had ruled that the western regions included all islands. It would be too long to recite the whole Papal letter, but these extracts may be thought curious and interesting:—"It is certain that Ireland and all islands on which Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, has shone... pertain to the right of the blessed Peter and the holy Roman Church." The Pope proceeds to say that Henry having signified his intention of invading Ireland in order to subdue it, to extirpate vices, to enforce payment of Peter's pence, and preserve the rights of the Church, he gives his blessing to

Digitized by Google

"so pious and laudable a desire," and declares that if he carries it out well he will "merit from God an immense and eternal reward." It is a sad, though to the cynical mind a curious spectacle, to see mankind playing with fantasies as though they were realities. We might follow down for centuries the Donation of Constantine and note its consequences. The Greek theologians learned to value it, and calling to mind the famous canon of the fourth Æcumenical Council, conferring on the Bishops of Constantinople equal privileges with those which belonged to the Roman See, they exulted in claiming for their own Patriarch all the state and dignity which Constantine had so lavishly bestowed on Rome. The great Emperors of Germany, the Henries, and the Othos ingeniously gave their own turn to this forged plaything of the legal disputant. They granted that Constantine had bestowed royal power over the west on Silvester, but so that the Empire itself and its dignities and pre-eminence were reserved. The Empire, they urged, had created the Papal supremacy. The Empire must be greater than its creature: it withdrew not what it had given, but must needs be paramount still.

The most audacious of Popes, the famous Innocent IV., took another view of the document. It was Christ Himself, said he, who gave full sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal, to Peter and his successors. Constantine, therefore, had not *granted* that which was not his to bestow, he had only given back to Peter that which was Peter's already by inalienable possession. Then arose statesmen and jurists who contended that the whole Donation was void. An Emperor might abdicate, so they pleaded, but he might not rend in pieces the Empire. He might limit his own power, but he could not bind his successors to the detriment of the Empire itself. Hence, said many lawyers, the document was null and void, only that perhaps long prescription might give it force.

And so to and fro the conflict raged, until another view of it arose. The growing wealth and corruption of the Church drew forth complaints, satires, or vehement denunciations on every hand. The poet Dante, the Waldensian Reformers, the poor fraternities, Wickliffe himself, were agreed in this. Constantine, they said, was the evil genius of the Church; he had loaded it with power and wealth, and had thus been the primal cause of its corruption.

But this was the last stage of this forgery's unbroken vitality. When printing opened to men the true writings of antiquity, it was impossible for this monstrous imposture to stand much longer. Yet for a century and a half the contest over its authenticity was maintained. At first the cry of the astonished canonists was hoarse and loud,—"He who denies the Donation

Digitized by Google

lies under suspicion of heresy." But the cry grew fainter and fainter, and at length Baronius, the great Roman historian, surrendered it as unauthentic. Since that time it has lain inactive, —a great dark shadow extending across the mediæval centuries, an evil thing and accursed in its history, as all lies must be. Its last palpable result ceased when the soldiers of Victor Emanuel entered the gates of Rome and the Pope withdrew to the Vatican. But those who list may trace its fruit still in many a decree and many a principle of changeless Rome.

From the Donation of Constantine, we pass to the more stupendous fabrication which soon followed it. About fifty years after our central epoch of A.D., 800, there appeared a collection of documents purporting to proceed from Bishops of Rome, beginning with the earliest centuries, together with other spurious writings. It included also the Donation of Constantine. It bore the name of Isidore of Seville, whose collection of acts and decrees of Councils had been in use for some two centuries, and whose name aided in giving currency to the fraud; it was at once adopted by the reigning Pontiff, Nicholas I., who required "the decretal epistles of the Roman Pontiffs to be received, even though they are not contained in the book of the Canons."

This marvellous forgery suddenly sprang into existence. It had nothing to authenticate it; it collapsed at the touch of criticism. No Roman controversialist attempts to maintain it: yet it retained its authority for centuries. It is incorporated in the Roman Canon Law; and it is still tacitly quoted by writers, and in documents of the highest influence, in the Roman communion. We can but concur in the reflection of the historian Gibbon: "By the same fortune which has attended the decretals and the Sybilline oracles, the edifice has subsisted after the foundations have been undermined." Pope Pius VI., in the last century, might express his willingness that this collection should be set aside and burnt,—"*igni etiam, si placet, concremandam;*" but it must still survive in the canonists and theologians who have adopted it.

Among the names of early Roman Bishops, thus freely used, we may specify Anacletus and Evaristus, in the first century; Alexander, Sixtus, Pius I., Eleutherus, Victor, and Zephyrinus, in the second; Callistus, and others, in the third and subsequent centuries. These forged epistles were, in some sense, artfully composed, though by a clumsy forger. The language of Ecclesiastical writers was woven together into the shape of epistles, supposed to be addressed to different persons, or Churches, for the most part on various disciplinary matters. In these epistles were scattered here and there strong assertions of the Papal authority. Thus Anacletus (on the Roman theory the second in

Digitized by Google

succession from Peter) was made to say: "Let the more difficult questions and the greater causes be referred to the Apostolical See, since the apostles commanded this by order of the Saviour." With a happy ignorance of history the forger makes the same venerable Bishop write to "*the patriarchs and primates*," that the Roman Church "obtained the primacy not from the apostles, but from the Lord our Saviour." Zephyrinus, at the end of the second or beginning of the third century, is supposed to speak thus of the trial of an accused bishop: "The end of his case should be remitted to the See of the Apostles, to be decided there. Nor should it be finished, as has been decreed of old by the Apostles, or their successors, until sustained by their authority... For the trials of Bishops, and graver Ecclesiastical causes,—as the Apostles and their holy successors have decreed,—are to be finally decided by the See of the Apostles, and by no other."

Callistus, the succeeding Bishop of Rome, is made to say: "As the Son of God came to do the Father's will, so shall ye fulfil the will of your mother, which is the Church, the head of which is the Church of Rome. Wherefore whatsoever may be done against the discipline of this Church, without the decision of justice, cannot on any account be permitted to be held valid."

These specimens may suffice. Thus the foundations of the Papal power were firmly established. Two principles were to be found in the Pseudo-Isidore. First, the decrees of Councils require Papal confirmation; secondly, the final appeal in all greater matters, whether of faith or discipline, lies to the Pope. Step by step, by the successive additions of subsequent generations, these principles have been unfolded into Papal supremacy as we know it.

By a special providence of God the forger stands continually self-convicted. For instance, Victor, Bishop of Rome, writes to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, who lived two centuries later. And books are continually quoted with entire disregard to the exigencies of chronology. It is something like the mediæval paintings, in which Israelite or Philistine warriors figure in complete plate armour of the fifteenth century, and St. Peter is equipped with chasuble and pall. So the late Dean Milman wrote:—

"But for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events, and the lives of distinguished men .... the false decretals might still have maintained their place in Ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favour; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day and throughout the later history of Christianity."

Digitized by Google

Yet, perhaps, the most miserable part of the story remains. These fictions, as we have already indicated, still bear sway. What authority can well be higher than that of the Catechism of the Council of Trent? That formula gives a similar definition of a sacrament to the one contained in our Church Catechism, which requires for its full character that it shall have been instituted by Christ? It may well be thought a work of insuperable difficulty to prove that our Lord instituted the five excluded Roman sacraments. But any one who reads the Catechism of the Council of Trent will see that the attempt is made to approach as nearly as may be to the Apostolic age, by frequent references to Popes Fabian, Melchiades, and others, whose names, as authors, are known only through this extraordinary forgery.

Finally, to come down to more recent times, few teachers have exercised more influence over modern Romanists, or have received higher Papal sanction, than Liguori,—Saint, Casuist, and Theologian,—who died 1787. Writing on the Papal Infallibility, he quotes first a spurious passage from Irenæus, proceeds with two forged letters from Athanasius, and then, referring to the forged decretals, adds—"The same was the opinion of Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, etc."

Who shall really slay a lie, as long as the father of lies lives? It is thus that a colour, at least, of extreme antiquity is thrown over the mediæval usage, and the devout Romanists to this day are taught to receive the forgeries of which their historians and controversialists have been long ashamed, and have been compelled either to ignore or to deal with as tenderly and subtilly as they may.

We can well understand how the faithful are warned off from the perilous ground of historical investigation, and how dangerous it must be to the faith of an ingenuous Roman youth to study history where Protestant freedom exists, and how necessary therefore a Romish University becomes. We can understand, too, the heat with which Cardinal Manning declaims against history, and boldly asserts that the questions at issue are articles of faith, and that historical criticism has nothing to say to them. "It is not," says he, "by criticism on past history, but by acts of faith in the living voice of the Church, at this hour, that we can know the faith."

For our part we indignantly repudiate this blind credulity. If the voice of the Church could utter falsehood of old, we may much doubt if "the living voice of the Church" is true. And if "the living voice," not only repeats, but intensifies the ancient forgery, can it come from the inspiration of Him who is "the Truth"?

Digitized by Google

Oh, for light! Light that is truth, and light that leads to truth, and faith on which unclouded light shines! Unsanctified, irreverent, criticism has, no doubt, led to unbelief, but the worst it has ever wrought has been as nothing to the wholesale infidelity produced by the indignant revulsion of educated Europe from a religion supported by forgery and forbidding unfettered investigation.

On the face of the crumbling precipice the geologist can read the physical condition of past ages. Stratum above stratum produces its peculiar fossils, and tells its history. So, too, in the history of man, century is piled upon century, and the present age rests upon all that has gone before. We have glanced at one stratum, and produced some characteristic fossils. There were many of the genus before, and there have been many since. Nor can this genus, whether fossil or living, be destroyed until the father of lies shall meet his last doom, and He shall come and reign for ever who has many glorious titles, but Who, in connection with this subject, we rejoice to know is styled the Light and the Truth, and of Whose realm this is told us,—"There shall be no night there."

RELATION OF EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN TO CURRENTS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

WHEN considering "the relation of Evangelical Churchmen to prevailing currents of religious thought," it is necessary to inquire what they are, how they affect Evangelical religion, and particularly the position and prospects of Evangelical Churchmen, and what is our wise and Christian attitude towards them.

Perhaps some of them ought to be called rather "currents of thought about religion," than "currents of religious thought;" but for practical purposes the distinction is not material. No doubt there are many minor currents, the chief ones, too, meet and cross, and mingle with each other in many various ways, and form many strange eddies and whirlpools of sentiment and opinion; but there are four which are marked and strong: the Scientific, the Anti-dogmatic, the Ecclesiastical, and the Enthusiastic. Of these the two which are most important are the scientific and the ecclesiastical.

In this nomenclature designations are intentionally adopted; which do not necessarily carry condemnation in their designation.

I. The *Scientific.*

The present is pre-eminently a scientific age. There may be

Digitized by Google

much so-called science which does not properly deserve the name; there may be many calling themselves men of science who have no scientific knowledge, in any right sense of the word; there may be an overweening monopolizing of the name of science in favour of what is, after all, only one department of it; but still there never were at any former period of the world's history so many able, patient, and thorough investigators of all the organisms, forces, materials, and phenomena of the universe, and never were observation and investigation rewarded by so many and such important discoveries. There is not in this anything which of necessity is antagonistic to Christian faith; and indeed not a few of the greatest scientific men are firm believers in revelation, and all their knowledge of the works of God has only filled them with a more intelligent faith in and adoration of the great God whose works they are; but yet the habits of mind, formed by a life-long devotion to scientific observations, and inductive reasoning from them, is unfavourable to simple faith. The very first principles of the inductive philosophy are to accept no facts which are not proved, nor explanations of those facts which are not demonstrated, and yet always to believe that there is a natural cause for every fact. To a mind thoroughly imbued with these habits of thought, Providence is apt to seem an impossible interference, and creation that which interposes a jarring break in the endless series of cause and effect. And then, too, so much which was once thought supernatural has been resolved into its natural causes, that it seems to many reasonable to believe that the remainder may be explained some day, and the supernatural eliminated altogether from an enlightened view of the universe. And, however this may be, the fact is sadly certain that a very large and influential body of scientific men deny all revelation, and either question, or regard as a thing which cannot be known one way or other, or deny altogether the very existence of a personal God, and necessarily therefore of an intelligent Creator; and the opinions of these men are echoed and supported and insinuated, and what is worse, assumed as true, by writers in every form of literature, until the faith of many is shaken. Very many of the most intelligent of our youth are avowed unbelievers, and in more there is an uneasy apprehension that somehow the discoveries of science are incompatible with the truth of Christianity. It need not be shown that this current of thought, so far as it has force, sweeps away not Evangelical religion alone but all religion whatsoever. It may suffice to observe that it is a current which is gaining in volume every day, and is perhaps at this moment the strongest of any in the educated mind of the world.

Digitized by Google

What then should be the attitude of Evangelical men towards it?

1. *Not* one of *fear*, but rather of faith. Christianity has outlived many phases and times of unbelief; the opinions which were thought to be triumphant over it have had their day and been forgotten, but it lives as fresh and powerful as it ever was. Voltaire thought that he had "crushed the wretch," but few now venture to assail Christianity with Voltaire's weapons. Butler commenced the advertisement to his great work with the statement, "It is come to pass, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious;" but his labours and those of others did their work, and a great revival of faith and true religion has since prevailed. Even within the memory of most men the school which sought to discredit Christianity by historic criticism is becoming discredited in its turn. The mythic theory of Strauss and the romance of Renan are almost nowhere now supposed to account for the records of the life of Christ. The discoveries of the early Egyptologers are now seldom alleged against revelation. The arguments against it from geological data may still have force with many, but most persons know that they are not the same as they were forty or even thirty years ago, for the simple reason that the geological theories themselves then held have been modified or abandoned. Depend upon it there is nothing more formidable, or likely to be more permanent in the materialistic and pantheistic oppositions which are now so prevalent. Nay, rather these are more certain not permanently to influence mankind than they were. They discarded revelation, but they left to man a Creator, a God, and therefore the possibility of a religion. These rob him altogether of a personal God, and therefore of religion; and religion is an instinct in human nature without which it never can nor will be long content. Even in thought an attitude of misgiving and fear ought not to be assumed because of this present atheistic positivism, any more than because of any of its predecessors in the procession of unbelief. Surely faith and not fear belongs to Evangelical Christians. We *know* that these things which we believe are true; we carry the witness of them in our own hearts and experience. We may well therefore in faith and patience await the issue of the strife. That which is true will never be proved to be false: scientific truth will never be really opposed to revealed truth, however it may for a time seem to be so to the partial vision of the friends either of science or of revelation.

2. And this leads to the consideration that our attitude towards men of science, even though they be unbelievers, ought

Digitized by Google

not to be one of obstinate contradiction. Belief in facts must not be withheld because they seem not to agree with our views of what revelation teaches. It is immoral in itself, and cannot serve the cause of truth, to refuse to believe what is sufficiently demonstrated. Rather the facts proved and truths discovered should be used as helps to the better understanding of revelation. Whilst the Bible was not intended to antedate the discoveries of science, its language has been so marvellously overruled that, teaching real truth to the most ignorant ages, it yet is found to be consistent, not with every theory which is imagined for a time, but with every proved fact in nature. As students of the Bible we owe much of our real knowledge of it to what the attacks of opponents have caused us to learn. Instead then of an attitude of hostility to real scientific research, Christian men should welcome those who make it, as fellow-workers in one common field of truth, and utilize their labours to help themselves in their knowledge of the works of our God.

3. But are we therefore to admit as true all which men of science put forth as true? Certainly not. We are not to be blind followers of authority in science any more than in religion. The power of scepticism in the present day consists very much in men thinking, "A and B are very able and learned and scientific men: they are able to investigate the question. They are persuaded that Christianity is not true. They can't be mistaken." But it is a great fallacy that because a man is an observer of nature he is therefore an infallible reasoner. Or that knowledge of chemistry or astronomy, of geology or comparative anatomy, makes a man any better qualified to judge of historic evidence, or moral or religious truth, than one who knows nothing of those particular departments of knowledge.

4. The right attitude ought to be one of rigid philosophical requirement. A lesson should be taken from our opponents: not theory, but proof,—not authority, but evidence,—not assertion, but definite reason should be demanded. For example: a man of science records observed facts. We must inquire whether his observation is sufficient and honest: not until convinced of this ought we to receive them. He propounds a theory to account for those facts: we must be convinced that it does account for them, and not leave any within its range unaccounted for. Until this condition is satisfied we may regard it as a plausible hypothesis; but we are unscientific if we accept it as a truth, and irrational if we take it as a basis for farther argument. And, to go a step further,—one alleges a discrepancy between science and revelation: we ought to require him to state, in plain and distinct terms, what the scientific truth is on the one side, and what the statement of revelation on the other, and why they are

Digitized by Google

irreconcilable. When this is done, and when it is demonstrated that the scientific statement is a truth and not a mere hypothesis, and the revealed statement really an assertion of Holy Scripture and not a mere deduction of men from it, for which Scripture is not responsible,—then, but not until then, ought we to admit, or our opponents to assert, that the Bible is contradicted by science. And this we may be well assured it never really will be: the works of God will never really contradict the Word of God. And here it may be remarked, that Christian men ought not to be hasty to assume that a theory propounded is contrary to revealed religion. Not long ago the Nebular hypothesis was denounced as being so: but who does not now see that its subject lies outside the domain of what the Bible speaks of, and that its admission rather enlarges our view of the power and wisdom of the Creator of the worlds. So again, the Atomic theory may have been joined to much false materialism; but the wisest philosophers now see in these atoms, not only the foundation-stones as it is thought of the universe, but also the strongest indications of creative design and wisdom.

5. But after all, whilst what has been described ought to be the Christian's attitude towards scientific research, and the current of thought which doubts the truth of revelation because it does not admit of scientific proof, we shall best keep out error by speaking the truth. Christian men will do well to study the converging evidence from many different sources of the historic truth and therefore Divine authority of our common Christianity. But we shall most persuade men by bringing the truths of the Gospel home to their hearts and consciences. Let them be proclaimed and urged, and the Holy Spirit Himself will by them convince men, and they will know of the doctrine that it is of God, so that nothing can shake their faith.

II. The *ecclesiastical* current of thought next demands our attention. This is in part a re-action from the Rationalistic current. Certainly it first presented itself outwardly in England as an avowed corrective of the sceptical and revolutionary tendencies of the times in which it came to the surface. In turn revulsion from it has added much to the force of the spirit of unbelief which prevails; and it is not improbable, that, as in the swing of the pendulum, the arc of oscillation is equal on each side of the vertical line, and it is the height to which it rises on one side which gives the force with which it ascends on the other, —so these two seemingly opposite mental movements may continue for some time to add extent and strength each to the other, according as men's minds are disposed to one or the other. But however this may be, the ecclesiastical current certainly exists, has increased, and is increasing. In itself it is not simple, but

Digitized by Google

compound. It is due in part to the æsthetic and romantic wave which had its rise in the writings of Scott and his cotemporaries, and which has produced a strongly revived taste for the fine arts, especially for music, painting, and architecture, and the special form of fiction which is the literary characteristic of the present age. It is partly also the outcome of the taste for luxury, and for the gratification of the psychical in distinction from the spiritual in man's nature (I use the Greek word, for which there is no exact English equivalent), which has been engendered in the present century by the unprecedented growth of wealth, of material and physical appliances, and of the number of persons who are without the necessity of unintermitting labour. These are not indeed identical with the religious movement, nor have they produced it of themselves. They influence not only the religious, but the whole tone and habits of modern society; and other agencies and tendencies have contributed to its rise. But they have rendered it possible in the outward form which it has adopted: they have made ornamental buildings, and ornate and ceremonial, and not sensual but sensuous modes of worship, such as fall in with the tastes and feelings of the men and women, and especially the youth of the age. And also (and that is very important) they have thrown a halo of romantic attraction over everything that is mediæval. Of these, then, the ecclesiastical movement has availed itself. It has incorporated them with itself: it has used them to attract and to gratify those whom it draws to itself. In men's minds they are identified with it, but they are really only its accessories and accidents. In its essence it is *sacerdotal*. It regards the Church as a society instituted by Christ for the maintenance and advancement of the truth and of His religion until He comes again. Then for all practical purposes it narrows the Church within the limits of the clergy, or as it prefers to call them, the priesthood. The laity it regards rather as the subjects than as the equal members of the ecclesiastical commonwealth. It centres in the priesthood all the teaching, all the authority, all the legislation, all the government of the Church. Nor only so,—it makes them a mediatorial class between Christ and men. It holds that He has vested in them the authority from Him to forgive sins. It makes the sacraments to be the only channel of grace; and the priest, each in his own place, the only administrator of the sacraments, and the only judge of how and to whom to give them. And then having thus exalted the priesthood, and further viewing it as a corporation of unbroken and perpetual succession, it applies to the Church, thus identified with it, the promises made to the true Church, of Christ's perpetual presence in it, of its continual guidance by the Holy Spirit, that "the gates of hell shall not

Digitized by Google

prevail against it;" and so it learns to receive as truth whatever the majority of the priesthood (meaning by priests, those who are supposed to have the grace of the priesthood by Apostolical succession in episcopal lines) in any age has held and taught, and consequently it regards the Reformation as simply a wicked revolt against the rightful authority of the Church, and goes back for its beliefs and its practices to mediæval times, and for present authority to those Churches of the East and the West which still include the great majority of the priesthood which it recognises.

It should not be matter for surprise that this movement should have acquired great force and following. There is much in it to commend itself to many different orders of mind. If at first sight it might seem to set up a system likely to be obnoxious to the laity, a larger view of human nature teaches that it is an instinct of the natural human heart to wish to interpose some one between itself and God; and that men in all ages have been content to yield themselves to those who would undertake the business of their souls for them, and to save them the trouble of private judgment and responsibility; and this independently of those æsthetic and material attractions with which this sacerdotal system has surrounded itself in practice. But in any case the strength of this current of ecclesiasticism is very manifest. It is seen in the architecture and altered services even of Nonconformists. It is seen in the advances of the Church of Rome in England and America, especially amongst the rich and fashionable classes. It is seen in the continual increase and development of the Romanizing and Ritualistic party in the Church of England. It must further be added, it is seen in the fact that a large majority of the English clergy are more or less what is called High Church in opinion, and in practical conflict rather defend than otherwise those even whom they regard as extreme. We cannot conceal from ourselves that if the sceptical wave has engulfed many of the best of our youth intellectually, this current carries with it in greater or less degree many of the more religiously disposed of all ages, and specially of the young. There is in all this much which is very inimical to Evangelical religion, and particularly to the power and influence of Evangelical religion within the Church of England. What, then, is the attitude which should be assumed in relation to it?

It is of course easy to say, One of distinct antagonism. This would be the natural impulse of many, and it would at first sight seem the most effectual method of counteracting this current. But it is not enough to say this. The question is, how it may *best* be counteracted? And that not as a matter of mere party strife or triumph, but so as really to promote the cause of God and true religion.

Digitized by Google

And here therefore it may be suggested that our course should be guided by the recognition and practical application of two principles.

First, that almost every error is a distortion of some truth, and owes much of its power and vitality to the truth it teaches, though not rightly; secondly, that every erroneous system owes its error, and therefore its power of mischief, to some truth which it neglects.

If these principles are true in relation to the subject under consideration, it seems that what we have to do is to search out what the truths are which this ecclesiastical movement has got hold of and is distorting, and to endeavour to develop them rightly and according to the proportion of faith; and also to mark what are the truths neglected by the system, and to bring them into their legitimate and beneficial prominence.

Assuming this to be a right view, some more particular application of it may be requisite.

(1) The corporate being, unity, and authority of the Church is a truth of great influence in this movement. Our course is not to deny or undervalue the truth, but to correct its misapprehension, to maintain that the true Church consists of all those, and none others, in whom the Holy Spirit really dwells, that the lay people are as much members of the Church as the clergy, and then to develop the Church as it ought to be developed, in giving to all their work to do and their voice and right place in the body.

(2) Again, the value of the sacraments as means of grace is greatly insisted on in this ecclesiastical movement. That they are of inestimable value is a truth, perhaps a truth which was at one time somewhat forgotten. It is our course not to ignore the truth because it is abused. But insisting on their true benefit, as received only by those who are in living union with Christ, and as operating through faith in the recipient and not as something done for or to him, to use the sacraments more zealously and believingly, and give them a right place in our teaching and preaching.

(3) So it is the claim of this movement that it has made our churches more becoming, our services more solemn, and our congregations more warm and devout. Well: without inquiring whether this claim is as well founded as its asserters think, let us admit and welcome the principle that we ought in all things to give to God of our best, yet all things ought to be done decently, reverentially, and in order,—that our services ought to be warm and bright and hearty; but let us show practically that all this may be obtained without any tawdriness or histrionic performance, without any materializing of a worship which ought

Digitized by Google

to be offered "in spirit and in truth," without any return to mediæval superstitions. Let us make our service warm by throwing our whole hearts into it, our music good by leading the whole congregation to cultivate it, our people devout by being reconciled to God in Christ.

Enough, perhaps, may have been said to indicate lines of thought which may be more fully followed out. It must, however, be added that the truths neglected in this ecclesiastical movement are what it is most important we should insist on.

(1) The One High Priesthood of Christ, ever present, ever available for every believer; and the common and equal priesthood of all His true members upon earth. If these are rightly understood the whole sacerdotal class and system are seen to have no necessity and no real place in the Church. And the exercise of their priesthood by all believers will give a work to each and a strength to all, which will develop both the growth and the life of the Church at large.

(2) Again, present forgiveness of sins for all who go to God through Jesus Christ. A forgiveness realized once for all in true conversion, and received day by day, as there is daily need, by each one who for himself confesses his sins to Him who is "faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." That is a truth never realized by those who are carried away by the sacerdotal error. They look for forgiveness through sacraments, through priests, through penance, through works, not simply through faith in Christ. Teach them herein to realize the truth, and they will be delivered from all their bondage.

(3) But above all, the supreme authority of the written Word of God. That is the great truth forgotten, or certainly not duly apprehended, both in the ecclesiastical, and so far as they are in error, by all these modern currents of thought. This appeals to the Church instead of to the Bible, the scientific to reason, the anti-dogmatic to philanthropy, the enthusiastic to the Spirit speaking in believers without the Word,—all dethrone Scripture from its undivided supremacy and authority. It is the primary duty of Evangelical men to replace it there; to maintain that God's Word is a revelation from Him, which all are bound to believe and obey; that the Church is only a keeper of God's Word, and has no authority except to teach out of it; that the Holy Spirit does indeed guide the people of God now, but only by enabling them to understand the Word. It is in the maintenance of these truths that we shall honour God, conserve the right, and best counteract every error. But of course it is not an abstract polemical assertion that the Bible is God's Word and the rule of faith which will avail. Persuaded that it is so,

Digitized by Google

we must try all systems by it, diligently search out all which it contains, and not so much assert that it does reveal truth as address with a firm faith to the hearts of all every vital truth which it reveals.

Such then ought to be our attitude to every current of honest religious thought. Not one of prejudice, of superciliousness, of indiscriminate condemnation; but one of respectful consideration, of separating the truth and error contained in it, of thankfully accepting the truth whether or no it agrees with our own previous ideas, of setting out against its error the full truth which it has distorted or ignored, of addressing ourselves in all things rather to the hearts and consciences than to the mere intellectual mind of men. So shall we be sons of truth, and God will use our instrumentality to bring men to the knowledge of the truth.

SERMONS.[a]

THERE is much, and we fear well-grounded complaint, that the English pulpit is not the effective power in the nation which it ought to be. For the purpose of remedying this evil, a society has just been formed, which is intended, so far as the Church of

---

[a] "The Clergyman's Magazine." London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.
"A System of Christian Rhetoric." By G. W. Hervey, M.A. London: Houlston. 1873.
"The English Pulpit; or, What to Preach and How to Preach." By an English Rector. New edition. London: Hatchards. 1875.
"Christ His Own Altar," and other Sermons, etc. By the late Hon. and Right Rev. Samuel Waldegrave, D.D., Bishop of Carlisle. London: Hunt. 1875.
"The Man after God's own Heart." By the Rev. Claude Bosanquet, M.A. Folkestone: Wiginton. 1875.
"Early Counsels." By the Rev. W. M. Hatch, M.A. London: Hayes. 1875.
"Gratuitous Redemption." By the Rev. Beedam Charlesworth. London: Nisbet. 1875.
Sermons by the Rev. George Maxwell, M.A. London: Nisbet. 1875.
"The Secret Trials of a Christian Life." By the Rev. G. E. Jelf, M.A. London: Morley. 1875.
"Lectures on the Philippians." By the Rev. R. Johnstone, LL.B. Edinburgh: Oliphant. 1875.
"Church and Home Lessons from the Book of Hosea. By the Rev. A. C. Thiselton, of Dublin. London: Nisbet. 1874.
"Short Sermons on the Psalms." By the Rev. W. J. Stracey, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1875.
"Eternal Life in Prospect and Possession." By the Rev. J. Graham. London: Shaw. 1874.
"The Battle and Burden of Life." By the Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.
"Sermons out of Church." By the Author of "John Halifax." London: Daldy. 1875.

Digitized by Google

England is concerned, to disseminate counsel and information which may be serviceable to the younger clergy. It is some gain that the consciousness of general inefficiency has been recognised by influential clergymen, and that there is a movement from within to meet a defect which has been largely commented upon from without. For our own part, we sincerely wish the Church Homiletical Society success in its laudable endeavours. It will have to be grievously mismanaged if it does not produce some appreciable results for good. The first number of its organ, "The Clergyman's Magazine," has just appeared, which seems sensible and practical, furnishing valuable assistance, but not superseding the necessity of individual effort. The "Topics and Outlines" suggested in it proceed from the Rev. Prebendary Griffith, late of Ram's Chapel. His name will be a guarantee that they are both sound and serviceable. While noticing it, we may also advert to a somewhat bulky volume, apparently of American origin. It is styled, "A System of Christian Rhetoric," by G. W. Hervey (Houlston and Sons). There is interspersed throughout it a great deal of sensible advice, with abundant anecdote. We could hardly undertake to recommend any one to sit down and study it with the view of thereby becoming an effective preacher. It would be very strange if he were not more bewildered than benefited, as is usually the case with those who are more fond of leaning upon others than trusting in themselves. Still much that will be found useful will be extracted out of it by those who use it judiciously, and resort to it for what they feel they want.

Our own impression is that the English pulpit suffers not so much from the matter which proceeds from it, as from the manner of utterance. We are of course now only referring to that preaching which may be comprehensively termed Evangelical, and which does not exclude the sensible and orthodox High Churchman. Again, by the "manner" we mean far more than the mere delivery. The substance of the sermons usually preached in the majority of English pulpits is good, full of wholesome admonitions, and containing much truthful exposition of Gospel truth. If the auditory could manage to command their attention, and to sustain it throughout, none would leave the Church without some profit. But how constantly not only the frivolous and profane are wearied, but even sober-minded Christians who frequent the house of God for purposes of edification, have to struggle hard to carry away with them any definite conception of what they have been listening to. Nothing has been said which they would be tempted to controvert, much which they thoroughly assent to; but little has moved or influenced them in the slightest degree. A task has been submitted to, instead of

Digitized by Google

there having been a benefit gained. This is peculiarly the case with persons who from the nature of their worldly employment, whether they are rich or poor, are not habituated to grasping the course of long and elaborate statements. These persons form the bulk of all congregations, almost without exception. To remedy this we must confess that we could wish that extempore preaching (by which we mean preaching without manuscript) prevailed among us much more extensively than it does. It might be much more prevalent than it is, although in some instances it would be wise to have recourse to the book. Whether for good or for evil, we have high authority for asserting that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." In village congregations more especially we feel that the English clergy lose a vast amount of influence by slavish bondage to manuscript. In the struggle with local preachers, and all the manifold agencies of Dissent, they are fairly outstripped by their competitors. The sermons of the clergy may be infinitely superior in all the essential qualities which ought to deserve consideration, but they are listened to with indifference, if not suspicion. The author of the "Rectory of Valehead" was not a fanatic, but he made it a *sine qua non* with his curates that they should preach extempore. That most holy and excellent man, himself coming late in life from a College Fellowship, and gifted with the most exquisite refinement and perfect culture, yet with a profound consciousness of the value of the souls committed to his charge, and feeling the importance that his ministry should not be blamed, at a somewhat advanced age cultivated the art of ready speech, and spoke to his rustic parishioners in a language that they "understanded." If there were more like him in the Church of England,—sober, yet earnest; scholars, yet simple folk, for Christ's sake; not "speaking unto the air," but uttering words easy to be understood by the unlearned,—we should hear little about the dulness of sermons. . The Church of England might forfeit something in the way of dignity, and lose somewhat of that massive divinity which is her glory; but the hold which she would gain upon the hearts and affections of the community, would more than compensate. As it is, while the present system continues, she will be perpetually distanced by the most ignorant and the most self-sufficient, to the infinite loss of true religion amongst us. If preaching has anything to do with oratory, there ought, we think, to be but one verdict. The advice of Dr. Guthrie is in itself most significant: he wrote his sermons "aloud." Whatever intermediate processes he adopted, he preached them as he wrote them; it is notorious with what success. If one half of the clergy of England would leave their manuscripts at home before they went to church, religion

Digitized by Google

would, we think, gain much; to the other half they might be indispensable adjuncts, for oratory is a gift as well as an art. We wish we could afford space to advert to the amount of irrelevant matter, for such we deem it, which is introduced into sermons, wasting most precious time and opportunities. How weary are congregations of perpetual explanations of the doctrines of the Pharisees and Sadducees, of copious elucidations of Jewish customs, and of such like small gear! If only instead men could be prevailed upon, without circumlocution, to "preach the Lord Jesus" to perishing sinners! We mean no disrespect to the Homiletical Society, but we cannot help cherishing a hope that the example of the American evangelists will be really powerful in this direction. That holy name has been as "ointment poured forth" by them, and the fragrance of it has drawn all men with rapt attention to it. What the locks of the Nazarite were to Samson, has the name of Jesus been to them,—the secret of their strength. In a pamphlet recently republished by an English rector, on "The English Pulpit," there are some valuable and pertinent remarks, on "What to preach and how to preach," well deserving consideration. We refer our readers to it.

We must not however allow ourselves to be diverted from our more immediate object, which is to review some volumes of sermons out of many which have been accumulating around us. For the most part they bear out the character which we would ascribe to English sermons. They abound in holy thought, in lucid statements of Divine truth, and in profitable application to the soul. We do not think we do them much injustice when we add that they are more adapted for thoughtful study in the closet, than for the purpose of pulpit addresses. Still they are a valuable boon to the Church, whatever may be the precise estimate formed of them as oratory.

Foremost among them are the sermons of the late Bishop of Carlisle, Samuel Waldegrave, of whom Mr. Ryle in his preface most justly asserts, that "it never could be said that the mitre in his case proved an extinguisher on his antecedents, or that his usefulness and faithfulness were checked by his promotion." Those who remember him know well that he was acceptable as a preacher, and we most heartily and fully concur in the estimate which Mr. Ryle has placed upon these sermons. The sermon on "Christ His Own Altar" is a most able vindication of what we believe to be the true sense of that much disputed passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We earnestly commend it, and all the volume, to the attention of our readers. Mr. Ryle has done good service in rescuing these fugitive pieces, and embodying them in an enduring form. It is refreshing to contrast the manly sentiment contained in this volume, with the sickly trash

Digitized by Google

which finds favour with so many in the present day. All is clear and intelligible, bearing the impress of purity and truth.

The next volume to which we would wish to call especial attention is "The Man after God's own heart," a series of sermons on the life of David. We have read them with great pleasure and interest. The main features of David's life are presented in a very vivid manner. There is much discrimination shown in commenting upon what was faulty in David, and the contrast between his fall and that of Saul, is ably delineated. Throughout the volume, the main object is apparently to make profitable application of the history: it is therefore well adapted to be placed in the hands of young persons, as it will furnish them with manifold lessons of spiritual experiences, in a way calculated to interest them. The whole teaching is thoroughly sound and scriptural. In the disastrous circumstances in which Folkestone has been placed it is indeed matter for congratulation that there is a ministry like that of Mr. Bosanquet still existing: a light shining in a very dark place. The volume he has just issued will enhance his reputation: it would be a valuable addition to lending libraries, for although distinctly homiletical, yet it would be attractive to many who would not feel interested in ordinary sermons.

In marked contrast with Mr. Bosanquet's useful labours is the volume entitled "Early Counsels," by the Rev. W. M. Hatch. The sermons were preached in the chapel of an institution (St. Paul's, Stoney Stratford), which gained a good deal of notoriety by its advanced ritualism at the period of its opening. The instruction in them which is harmless is meagre, but there is a good deal that is harmful. Bishop Waldegrave speaks of "the Supper no Sacrifice." Mr. Hatch talks of the "Sacrifice of the Altar:" an expression not recognised by the Church of England. Sacramental religion is the staple of these "Early Counsels." We find ourselves in the company of S. Mary and S. Nathaniel. As a fair specimen of Mr. Hatch's teaching we quote the following passage from a sermon entitled "Spiritual Worship." The preacher says, "The teaching of the Spirit is reflected in the Church. The worship, the ceremonies, the ritual of the Church are not of man's devising, but are the expression of the mind of God the Holy Ghost, who has inspired the saints, and doctors, and councils to think those things that be good and helpful for salvation." If this be indeed so, books like Merati's on the Ceremonies of the Church, and the "Directorium Anglicanum" might almost, if not quite, be placed on a level with Holy Scripture, and there would be something like a show of reason for the fanatical proceedings recently reported from St. Alban's, Holborn. It is not quite the teaching of the Church of England which

Digitized by Google

speaks (Article xxxiv.) of ceremonies and rites as "ordained only by man's authority." We are sorry to be compelled to say of Mr. Hatch's "Early Counsels," "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge."

We notice next, two volumes which have this in common, that they are both tributes by pastors to former congregations. "Gratuitous Redemption," by the Rev. Beedam Charlesworth, formerly of Darfield, ought to have had much earlier notice from us. It is a volume of sterling merit, displaying with considerable ability the great truths of the Gospel in a very plain and forcible manner. Mr. Charlesworth is a sound and experienced divine: there are no idle crotchets or strainings after fantastic interpretations of the Word of God in his sermons. Sobriety and good sense, combined with unction and earnestness, characterize his teaching; although not himself one of the earlier evangelicals, he has those qualities which made their preaching a power in our midst. Mr. Maxwell's "Sermons" have been collected by the filial piety of his daughter, and dedicated by her to his former parishioners in Dorsetshire. They are simple, and unpretentious, but scriptural and true. We can well believe that they were acceptable to a village congregation, for whose edification they seem well adapted. "The Secret Trials of a Christian Life," is a volume of sermons by the Rev. G. E. Jelf, son of the late Dr. Jelf, of King's College, London. Amid much that is good and profitable there are allusions to unwholesome practices, such as auricular confession, and the value of priestly absolution, which are not, in our judgment, the less dangerous because they are not urged obtrusively. A castigated edition of Mr. Jelf's sermons might leave a fairly useful volume, but we suspect that he would be exceedingly loath to part with what we deem to be very objectionable, marring the value of his book.

As Mr. Johnstone's "Lectures on the Philippians" were preached as sermons to his congregation in Glasgow we make no apology for including them in our present article. He has appended to them a translation of the Epistle, with a brief commentary, and the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians. It is remarkable that a Church like that of Philippi, conspicuous for Christian excellence, so far as any record has been preserved of it, should have been so completely extinguished as it was. It would almost seem a realization of the old saying, "Whom the gods love die young." There is very much which we can heartily commend in Mr. Johnstone's lectures. Students of St. Paul's writings will find them useful, both for instruction and edification. Of the translation we need only say that if it removes some blemishes from our authorized version it reads in many places harshly, and grates upon us very unpleasantly.

Digitized by Google

"Church and Home Lessons from the Book of the Prophet Hosea," by Mr. Thiselton, contain many brief, but suggestive comments upon this precious portion of the Word of God. We question whether the prophet Hosea is really a "deserted well," at any rate by spiritually-minded Christians. Our impression is that many such resort to these prophecies freely, as indeed "wells of salvation." Be this, however, as it may, we have to thank Mr. Thiselton for his successful effort to allure more of Christ's people to frequent them. There is much felicity of illustration throughout these useful lessons.

Mr. Stracey's "Short Sermons on the Psalms" are neat, and well written. There is in them a good deal of wholesome counsel fairly adapted for a village church. No offensive practices savouring of Romanism are urged, and all the teaching may be accounted thoroughly loyal to the Church of England: it is, too, in many particulars, scriptural and devout. But it is curiously characteristic of the school to which Mr. Stracey belongs, that while the importance of partaking in the Lord's Supper is perpetually inculcated, the duty of private study of the Holy Scriptures is hardly dwelt upon. The people are to love them, to "love to be taught" them, but are not urged to search them. They are exhorted to come to the church out of crowded homes, for solitary prayer there: there is no allusion to family prayer at all.

"Eternal Life in Prospect and Possession" has come to us from Australia. The subject is an all important one, and has been often canvassed. We do not know that much additional light has been thrown upon the subject by Mr. Graham, but his volume will be interesting to those who yearn after the secret beyond the grave. "The Battle and Burden of Life" is intended for the young. It is an exposition of a very familiar portion of the Epistle to the Ephesians. There does not seem in it much peculiarly appropriate to young persons, but, perhaps, Mr. Baldwin Brown means young believers who are not of necessity young in years, but in experience of the divine life. To them it will be suggestive of much that is valuable.

The sermons we have hitherto reviewed have been sermons in church. We have now to comment upon "sermons out of church." It is hardly necessary to say that the author, as a practised litterateur, has produced a very readable volume. It teems with many valuable practical thoughts, but it is sadly marred by the writer's ignorance or contempt for the teaching of the Bible. If we had to define her school of theology we would assign her to that of the late Lord Palmerston, rather than that of the Prophets and Apostles. There is the same jaunty dogmatism and trenchant style. His sheet of white paper and soap

Digitized by Google

re-appear constantly throughout her pages. In addition to these she has reproduced all the ignorant jibes of Dickens about missions, and charity which begins at home. We suppose it is the temptation of saying, or rather repeating what seem to be smart things, that leads an accomplished writer into statements which are, we do not hesitate to say, mere vulgarisms. This fatal defect of ignoring the plainest statements of the Word of God, and substituting in their room the author's own crotchets, has marred what might have been otherwise, in many respects, a sensible and useful book. We, by no means, assent to all the author's theories, especially on the subject of the education of children: still even upon this she has some useful counsel to offer. Nor do we presume to offer any reflections upon her personal religion, which, as she discloses it, is of a very peculiar kind; but when we put the book down, the thought forced itself upon us that, as it was predicated of Lord Brougham that if he had only known something of law he might have been a very distinguished Judge, so if the author of John Halifax had only understood the teaching of the Bible she might have been very useful in her day and generation.

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. V.

General Remarks.

THE divinely-appointed Sacrificial System of the Jews has now been brought under review in its leading aspects; but many questions have suggested themselves during the discussion, which call for a brief notice. And, first, it will be remembered, that offerings were no novelties to the Children of Israel. Apart from the rites which they must have beheld in Egypt, the people retained among them some knowledge of the past. The names of their ancestors, the patriarchs, were familiar to them; and some traditional knowledge of the events recorded in Genesis must have been handed down from father to son till the days of Moses. If the narratives concerning Cain and Abel, and concerning Noah's offerings, had well-nigh faded from their memory, yet such an event as the offering of Isaac, and the subsequent intervention of God on his behalf, can hardly have been forgotten. Thus, even supposing that the people had no theological or philosophical theory as to the origin or meaning of such things, yet the command to approach God through the bloodshedding of animals would not sound unnatural to their ears. In ceremonial,

Digitized by Google

as in morality, nothing strange or unheard of was prescribed by the law of Moses; but there was simply such an adaptation of existing rites, and such a republication of acknowledged duties, as God saw fit to set before His people "for their good."

Secondly, the people were never taught to regard the Levitical institutions as a substitute for morality. If an Israelite sinned against his neighbour, he had to pay the penalty according to the nature of his offence. The priest might sometimes be called upon to act as judge in such matters; but no burnt-offerings or sacrifices could be a substitute for plain duty either to man or to God. To obey was better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

Thirdly, we must distinguish between the immediate and practical object of the system, and its typical or symbolical object. The immediate object was to keep alive the idea of the sinfulness of sin, and to open the door of hope to the sinner. The whole ritual of the tabernacle implied,—first, that a medium was needed, whereby man might approach his Maker; and secondly, that such a medium was forthcoming, having been provided by God Himself. The fact that the rites were issued under Divine authority, amidst the grandeur of Sinai's awful thunder and strange sights, proved that the God of glory was willing to be gracious; but that He required men to approach Him in the appointed way,—through priest, altar, and shed blood.

Again, the variety in the offerings is very remarkable, and was evidently intended to satisfy the manifold requirements of the longing heart. Thus one man may have asked the question, How does God regard me? Is He favourably inclined towards me, as He was towards Abraham and Isaac and Jacob? The answer lay in the ascending offering, which specially indicated God's acceptance of the offerer.

Another man, pressed down with the burden of sin, feeling that he had through the frailty of his nature come short of the glory of God, would ask, Is there pardon for such a man as I am? The answer was to be found in the sin-offering, and the guilt or trespass-offering. In those rites the finger of God's priest was seen to drip with the appointed victim's blood, some drops of which were let to fall on the altar of acceptance. Thus sin generally, and special sins in particular, were represented as blotted out through the sprinkling of blood.

Another man might wish to let his personal and family joys become sanctified by the halo of the Divine presence. He might wish to realize his oneness with that God from whom he had received life and salvation and innumerable blessings. This he did through the sacrificial feasts, the peace-offerings, and the votive-offerings, in eating which the worshipper was made a

Digitized by Google

partaker with God. He thus had fellowship or communion with the unseen Source of all his happiness and prosperity.

It is a mistake to regard the Levitical ritual as a heavy bondage, or as a waste of animal life. God did not weary the people with His demands. The greater part of the sacrifices were really social feastings, and their celebration was a time of great happiness, not only to the offerers, but to their neighbours and dependents. All rejoiced together before the Lord, and often exhibited their gladness by the accompaniments of music, singing, and dancing. The proportion of whole burnt-offerings was small in comparison with that of the sacrificial feasts, in which the worshipper and his friends shared.

But although the Jewish ritual was not a bondage, its restrictions were a most serviceable hedge, fencing the worshippers off from the idolatrous customs of the surrounding people. It was a middle wall of partition, intended to seclude the people from the follies, vanities, and vices of Egypt and Canaan, and to be a distinguishing mark whereby all should know that Jehovah, the God of Israel, was the one living and true God. Not only were the Levitical rites free from all the gross impurities which disfigured all the other systems of worship then prevalent, but also the principle on which these rites were based was wholly different. According to heathen theology and ritual, man was to propitiate or appease God by his offerings; but according to the Mosaic legislation, man could do nothing: all was of God. The priest, as God's representative, was to sprinkle the blood of the appointed victim on God's altar, in order to exhibit in shadow the Divine way of pardon. God accepted the sinner, not by virtue of what he did, for all his most righteous acts were sinful; but by virtue of His own free love and compassion, which found vent through a way of His own appointment. Propitiation came from God to man, not from man to God. The Almighty and all-merciful One was in the offering reconciling the sinner to Himself. Thus the worshipper had something secure—something outside himself—to rest upon. He pleaded a sacrifice which received its sacramental efficacy from the will and favour of that very God whom he sought to approach.

Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged, as stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the sacrificial rites appointed by God through Moses, could not make the worshipper perfect as pertaining to the conscience; for what was the central point in these rites? The sprinkling of the blood of bullocks, goats, lambs or kids, on the altar, by priestly hands. And what reasonable man could suppose that the blood of the lower animals could take away sin? Could the smell of the ascending blood and fat really gratify God? Could it appease His wrath?

Digitized by Google

Could it make amends for sin? Could it cause Him to accept the offender? The well-instructed Israelite knew that all the cattle on a thousand hills were God's; that the smell of goats' flesh or the blood of bulls, were nothing in themselves to Him; that He needed none of these things, seeing it is He that giveth life to all His creatures. And yet the fact remained, that the whole system centred round the blood of the victim. This was plainly announced in Lev. xvii. 10—14. The blood represented the life. When the blood ceases to circulate, death ensues. Hence blood-shedding signified the giving up of the life or soul, and blood-sprinkling on the altar symbolized the presentation of the vicarious offering to the Most High. Accordingly no Israelite was allowed to eat the blood of animals. It was either to be sprinkled on the altar, or poured out by its side, and that, by the priest; and even in the case of an ordinary meal, it was to be poured into the earth, and covered with the dust. God gave or appointed the life-blood of the animal as an atonement, to represent the life-blood of man. Death was the normal punishment of sin, and every sinner's life-blood was due to God. All souls were His, and the soul that sinned was thereby doomed to death. Yet He permitted man to give up the life of the animal as the representative of his own life, and He condescended to accept the one instead of the other as a provisional course, until the revelation of a new and better way.

There can be little doubt that atonement by blood was an ordinance from the very first. As the skins of the animals were given by God to be a covering or shelter for the shame and nakedness of our first parents, so the blood of these same animals was probably appointed by Him as a covering, or shelter, or atonement (for the word in the original is the same) for their sin. Otherwise Adam and Eve must have died in the very day in which they sinned, for from that moment their life was forfeited. There can be little doubt that Abel kept flocks and herds, and offered the firstlings and the fat to the Lord, because he believed that their life-blood would be accepted as an atonement for his; and when his own blood was shed by the hand of his brother, it cried unto the Lord from the dust, and God was bound to hear that cry, because atonement had already been made for the slain man through the blood of the appointed victims.

The narrative of the offering of Isaac is very instructive. When Abraham was about to slay the son in whom all his hopes lay, accounting that God was able to raise him from the dead the angel of the Lord called to him and checked him. Thus it was that he saw the ram caught in a thicket by his horns, and he offered him up *instead of* his son. The son's life was due,

Digitized by Google

but the ram's life was offered and accepted as *a substitute*. This incident is the key to the whole system. It also indicates wherein the imperfect and unsatisfying aspect of that system consists: viz., in the substitution of the brute for the man, of the lower for the higher. It was manifestly only a provisional arrangement, God having prepared some better thing for us, that the patriarchs and Israelites without us might not be made perfect. The imperfection of the system was what necessitated the constant repetition of an ordinance which could never satisfy either the demands of a guilty conscience or the requirements of a just God. A victim which could have purged away one sin, could have washed all men clean; but animal offerings could not take away a single sin.

The one hopeful fact about them was that they were appointed by God. The provision for sin, though temporary and shadowy, was from Him; and if it was ineffectual, He would in His own time provide something better. The Israelite was simply to carry out the Divine orders, and leave the rest with God. How far they realized this, it is impossible to say; but one cannot read the Psalms without feeling that the pious Israelite was just resting on God's *Word*. He accepted what was revealed, "as a weaned child," drinking in the grace of God, and realizing that there was forgiveness with Him, without fully comprehending the way.

The Israelite was never allowed to imagine that the sacrificial rites in themselves conferred pardon or justification, or that they were to be regarded as a substitute for righteousness. Whilst taught that they opened the door of hope to every man who felt the infinite distance between himself and his Maker, he was by no means led to suppose that they set him free from his duties, or that he had license to live as he liked, provided only that he offered plenty of sin-offerings or sacrifices.

Of course human nature was the same then as now, and there was a constant danger of resting on rites and forms, to the disparagement of motives and actions. But God's Word never sanctioned such a course; on the contrary, it strictly provided against formalism, and against the resting on ceremonies as if they were in themselves acceptable to the Most High.

God always required men to love Him with all their hearts, to love their neighbour as themselves, to hate robbery, oppression, lying, impurity, sensuality, and the various corruptions and vices to which poor human nature is all too prone. External and ceremonial cleanness was prescribed to those who presented sacrifices and held feasts (see Lev. vii. 19—21, and other passages); but it was not to take the place of holiness and purity of motive. Men were to wash their hands in innocency, and so were to go to God's altar. (Ps. xxvi. 6.) The sacrifices

Digitized by Google

of God were to be offered by men whose hearts were broken and contrite through a sense of sin (Ps. li. 17); by men who longed to be righteous (Ps. iv. 5); and by men who really desired to praise God for His mercies. (Ps. l. 14—23.) To obey was in itself a better course, and more agreeable to God than the partaking of a sacred feast; to hearken to His Word was better than the fat of rams. If a man regarded iniquity in his heart, God did not hear prayer. (Ps. lxvi. 18.) Accordingly the wise man says, "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than a sacrificial feast;" and again, "The sacrificial feast of the wicked is an abomination: how much more when he bringeth it in wickedness." (Prov. xxi. 3—27; see also Pro. xv. 8, xvii. 1.)

Many passages in the prophetic writings will occur to the mind as illustrative of this point. Take for example the words recorded in the fifth chapter of Amos. After speaking of the idolatry, oppression, and corruption of the people, the Lord speaks thus: "I hate, I despise your feast-days, I will not smell (the savour of the ascending-offerings and of incense) in your solemn assemblies. Though ye present to me your ascending-offerings and meat-offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Again we read in Jer. xiv. 10—12: "Thus saith the Lord unto this people, Thus have they loved to wander, they have not refrained their feet, therefore the Lord doth not accept them; He will now remember their iniquity, and will visit their sins. Then said the Lord unto me, Pray not for this people for their good. When they fast, I will not hear their cry; and when they cause an ascending-offering and a meat-offering to rise up, I will not accept them: but I will consume them by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence." (Com. also Is. i. 11, etc.)

These and similar passages show conclusively that sacrificial rites were ineffectual where the spirit and life of the offerer were set against the law of the Lord. The tabernacle services were specially appointed for those "who seek the Lord," not for those who "regard not the Lord, neither the operation of His hands."

The truth here insisted upon receives confirmation from the first recorded instance of the presentation of an offering. Two men went up to the presence of the Lord, which was probably the gateway of the Garden of Eden, where the tree of life might have been still visible.[a] (See Gen. iv. 3, etc.; also compare

[a] Acceptance was attainable symbolically in Abel's days at the gate of Paradise, but after Noah's days the offerings had to ascend. Abel simply *brought* his victims, but Noah had to *offer up* his on an altar (Gen. viii. 20.)

Digitized by Google

Jacob's expression, Gen. xxviii. 17.) The works of one of these men were righteous, the works of the other were wicked. (1 John iii. 12.) The one presented his offering by faith (Heb xi. 4); that is to say, he believed that the way of acceptance which God had revealed to him and to his father, was the appointed way. He rested not on his own works, but on the word of promise for justification unto life. Accordingly his gift was regarded favourably by the Most High. The offering of the other was not of faith: he neglected the appointed way, and he came not in the right spirit; and consequently he was not accepted. A full consideration of this narrative, and of the inspired comments on it contained in the New Testament, will convince us that two things were necessary in order than an offering should be accepted: there must be a right offering, and it must be presented in a fitting spirit. *Faith* in God's revealed Word really involves both of these.

At first sight it might appear as if this view of the offerings were opposed to the grand teaching of the Old and New Testament, with regard to pardon for all sinners and for all sin. It is not so, however, really. The Scriptures universally announce that pardon is for the *repentant* sinner, not for him who goes on still in his wickedness; and one great object in unfolding the goodness of God, both to the Israelite in their providential history, and to all nations in the Gospel of Christ, is to draw men to repentance by exhibiting the Divine attributes in their true and attractive aspect, and by setting forth the way in which fallen man may avail himself of God's infinite mercy. Where there is no acknowledgment of sin and no acceptance of God's way, there is no pardon and no hope; but when the wicked man turns away from his sins, attracted by the loving invitation of God, who takes the initiative throughout, then the Lord will abundantly pardon, for in such a case He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. (1 John i. 9.)

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

ON THE PROPOSED REVISION OF OUR AUTHORIZED VERSION.

[The following paper does not embody our own views. We do not agree with all the statements in it, especially those regarding the members comprising the Royal Commission. Some of them, moreover, ought to be modified to represent more accurately the present condition of the question. We think that some revision is salutary and expedient. It does however represent the feelings

Digitized by Google

of many godly persons, who are laudably jealous of a version so time-honoured, and which has been so fruitful in blessing, as our English Bible. Even if these feelings were only prejudices, respect and consideration ought to be extended to them. At any rate it is well that there should be a representation of these feelings. The present communication is as it were a voice from the grave. It was found amongst the papers of the late Rev. Hobart Seymour, and was intended to have been for publication in the *Christian Advocate*. In his day he was "valiant for the truth upon the earth," and rendered most effectual service to it. It would be due to his memory to testify regard by listening to this his latest utterance; but the paper has intrinsic merits of its own. So far we accord with it, that we should much regret any authoritative imposition of a new version until it has been fairly for some time before the world, and exposed to the full animadversion of critics who have not been engaged upon it. It should win its way by its superior fidelity in reproducing the teaching of the Spirit of God, not by any arbitrary act of power. Even if the new wine may be good, it must be quite clear that the old is worse, before it is set forth for the refreshment of the world to the exclusion of the old.] —EDITOR.

FOR nearly a thousand years the Holy Scriptures were practically ignored in the Church of Rome. The old Latin version, known commonly as the Vulgate, was the version supposed to be in use: and so little was it valued, and so much was it neglected, that no two copies were alike; and not unfrequently the sacred writings were effaced in order that some monkish legend might be written in their stead. The monkish copyists, superstitious in everything else, had no Jew-like superstition for the sacred volume. They neither counted the words nor reckoned the letters. Words, sentences, and half-sentences, were carelessly omitted; and words and sentences and half-sentences were as carelessly inserted where they ought not. Each copy differed from every other copy, till at last printing introduced some uniformity. But at the Council of Trent this state of the Holy Scriptures weighed heavily on the assembled divines. It was resolved among the many varying versions, or rather copies of the same version, the Vulgate should be recognised and authorized as the version, and only version, in the Church of Rome. Instead of going to the fountain's-head,—instead of going to the original Hebrew and Greek,—the Vulgate was regarded as superior to the originals: it was declared that it, and only it, was to be held as authentic.

"The sacred and holy synod, considering that no slight usefulness may accrue to the Church of God, if out of all the Latin editions of the sacred books now in circulation, it be made known which among them is to be held as authentic, ordains and proclaims that

Digitized by Google

the Old and Vulgate edition, which by the use of so many ages has been approved in the Church, be held as authentic in public lectures, disputations, preachings, and expositions; and that no one is to dare or to presume to reject it under any pretence whatsoever."

Thus "the Old and Vulgate" edition was to be "authentic." The word is of rather equivocal meaning, the more so as no two copies, except those that were printed, could be said to be precisely similar. This was of course foreseen at the time, and Pope Sixtus V. immediately undertook an "authentic" edition of the sacred volume; not indeed of "the Old and Vulgate," but what he thought was such, and which was really the version of St. Jerome. This "authentic" edition soon appeared, surrounded with all the sanction of the Papal authority. It was welcomed with loud hosannahs as the infallible edition. But soon afterwards Pope Sixtus slept with his fathers; and Pope Clement VIII. could find neither authenticity nor infallibility in this edition of Pope Sixtus. He had no mercy for it; he dealt with it with unsparing hand; he applied himself with intense zeal and determination to the work, and prepared another edition with no less than two thousand alterations! He soon launched it on the world, as the authentic edition contemplated by the Council of Trent. And thus while under the sanction of the Council there was to be an authentic edition, these two Popes issued two authentic editions differing from one another in some two thousand places! The writer of these pages has seen in the library of the Collegio Romano the very copy of the defective edition of Pope Sixtus, which was in the hands of Pope Clement for revision and correction. In the margin are all the several alterations and emendations in the hand-writing of Pope Clement himself. It is a small and neat hand; and though many of the corrections are of no moment in a practical or doctrinal view, yet they demonstrate how two varying Bibles can both be proclaimed "authentic," and that two Popes can be at war with each other as to which Bible is to be received as authentic,—as the Bible contemplated by the Council of Trent.

It was this variance between these two Popes that gave birth to the old controversy of the *Bellum Papale* (the war of the two Popes); and at the time this controversy did a great work, and had great results, against the Church of Rome. Each party claimed, as from the Council of Trent, the title of "authentic;" and the Protestants (especially Thomas James, who was librarian of the Bodleian) handled with great power the weapon thus placed in their hands to show that the two Popes could not alike be infallible.

We must be on our guard that among ourselves the proposal for a new version of the Bible does not produce two varying Bibles.

Digitized by Google

Whoever gains by such a result, the Church of England must certainly be the loser. No greater disaster could befall her than there being two Bibles,—a Churchman's Bible and a Dissenter's Bible; or if a greater disaster could by possibility darken her horizon, it would be a High-Churchman's Bible and a Low-Churchman's Bible. It would be a war of Bibles,—the Churchman speaking against one version, and the Dissenter refusing to be bound by the other; while the High-Churchman and the Low-Churchman would be shaking their heads, and rejecting the language, and speaking lightly of the Bible of each other: it would be one more element of controversy added to our unhappy dissensions. This war of versions might be a temptation to unhallowed language on the most hallowed treasure we possess; it would dethrone the sacred volume from it's alone supremacy in the eyes of the masses of our people. Each version would be decried and depreciated by the partizans of the other; and the result would be that the multitude might feel that neither was to be depended on as the Word of God.

There are indeed persons and parties whose interests might be subserved by such a depreciation of the sacred volume. The Church of Rome could shout her alleluias, and every Romish chapel in the land could sing the *Te Deum* in thanksgiving for the fall of the Holy Scriptures: it would be to her a source of joy and rejoicing, however it might grieve and wring the hearts of every faithful one. The Tractarians and the Ritualists might anticipate benefit from such an event. The hallowed volume once fallen from it's high eminence as the sole rule of faith, there might be some hope for the enthronement of the Church and of tradition in its stead. The foundation of all their sacramental system, their vestments and incense and candles, and all their unscriptural doctrines, was laid on a depreciation of the Scriptures; and they could now hope to reap the harvest of all they had preached and written against the sufficiency, the certainty, and the authority of the Scriptures. But their preaching and writing against the sacred volume did not require the dropping of the water incessantly till it wore away the hardest marble. It fell at the Universities on a congenial soil; and the inexperience of youth soon made many a prey to the spoiler. The young minds soon went farther than their teachers: they adopted not only the teaching, but all the corollaries that flowed from such teaching; the result has been the widespread and wasting spirit of infidelity. Men learned from their Tractarian teachers to depreciate the Scriptures; and they were not long in learning to enthrone what they call Reason in their stead, so as to establish Rationalism as better than Scripture. Now all these parties,—the Roman Catholics, the Tractarians,

Digitized by Google

the Ritualists, the Rationalists (or infidels),—could reckon on gaining something by this depreciation of the Scriptures. They could look on with smiling complacency upon the war of Bibles; they might hope to gain something by it; but it would give a shock such as has never yet been known in the whole annals of the Church of Christ, to all that is pure, and holy, and pious, and evangelical in this land. Such a war of Bibles must turn that precious volume, which has been the one bond of union among us amidst all our unhappy divisions, into an element of further disunion; and must make that which was the source of peace and holiness and love a means of strife and bitterness and hate, until it lost it's high position and old supremacy in the affections of the masses of our people.

The religion of the people of England is essentially the religion of the Holy Scriptures. Whatever divergence there may be between Conformist and Nonconformist, the religion of all is essentially the religion of Holy Scripture. These are the very life-blood of all our Protestant and Reformed Churches. When Wycliffe first gave the Holy Scriptures to the people of England in their own language, he gave them that which was for centuries a sealed book and was now an open Bible; and in that act he laid the foundations of the Reformation in this land, and won his title as the Morning Star of the Reformation. It was in one of his sermons in those times he gave utterance to words that ought to be graven in our memories for ever: "All truth is contained in Scripture. We should admit no conclusion not approved there. There is no court but the court of heaven. Though there were an hundred Popes, and though all the Fryars in the world were turned into Cardinals, yet we could learn more from the Bible than from that vast multitude." These burning words were uttered five centuries ago; and uttered too by that brave man, who, of all his countrymen, first gave the Holy Scriptures to the people of England in the language of the people of England. It was a noble and a precious gift, and one that may well embalm his name in our memories for ever. Its chief defect arose from the defect of the times; for it was only a translation not from the original, but from the Latin version then in use in the Church of Rome. But it did its work in the heart of England until a century and a half afterwards, when the version of Tyndale appeared. This was a translation from the originals. This was followed soon afterwards by what was called Mathew's Bible; and this again was succeeded by that of Coverdale. Then followed in rapid succession, to meet the thirsting of the people of this land, the Great Bible, in 1539; then the Genevan Bible, in 1560; then the Bishop's Bible, in 1568: and the demand still increasing, the one usually called

Digitized by Google

the Authorized Version, having received the authority of the Crown, was completed in 1611.

It is said that fifty-four men, the most learned of those times and most versed in the requisite languages, were occupied in this—to them—most grateful work. They were men of deep and profound piety, as well as of deep and profound scholarship. They did not handle their holy work as some scholars of these our days, as if Moses was no more inspired than Herodotus, or as if Isaiah was no more under inspiration than Homer; nor did they enter on it, as some would now recommend, as if all prayer was an officious or useless interference with the chain of natural causation. They applied themselves to this great work with a sanctified scholarship, with profound reverence, with prayerful hearts, and with a deep conviction that they were handling not the uninspired, but the inspired,—"not as the word of man, but (as it is in truth) the Word of God." And when they had completed their grateful task, they launched it on the world with these solemn and touching words:—

"It remaineth, gentle reader, that we commend thee to God, and to the Spirit of His grace, which is able to build further than we ask or think. He removeth the scales from our eyes, the veil from our hearts, opening our wits that we may understand His Word: enlaying our hearts,—yea, correcting our affections,—that we may love it above gold and silver; yea, that we may love it to the end."

Such was the holy spirit,—the evangelical spirit of those scholars to whom we are debtors for our *Authorized Version*. It has been a great Book—that grand old Bible—for the people of England. For two centuries and-a-half it has moulded the religion of England: it is the creed of her people, and emphatically it is the life-blood of their religion. How often has it been the riches of the poor, the balm beside the bed of sickness, and the fountain of the happiness of the happy! It has been the source from which the loving mother has drawn her gentle teaching in our early childhood, and the well-spring of all the wise counsels of the honoured father in our hot youth; it has been the holy oracle that has given life and value and power to the ministry of our parish clergy; it has been the one Book whose stories awakened the first thrilling interest of our childhood, and the one Book that has quickened the living faith and holy life and fervent charity of old age. That precious volume has won its place in every household; in the cottage of the peasant, as well as in the halls of our nobles; in the hovel of the poorest, as well as in the palace of our sovereigns. Its words—the words of our Authorized Version—are associated, as household words, with every stage of our lives, with the happy days of our mar-

Digitized by Google

riage, with the holy christening of our children, with the burials of the loved and the lost, with all the holy Sabbaths and hallowed services of our Church. We have loved this precious volume from our cradle, and we will love it to our grave.

It is this book, the very language of which is interwreathed with every stage of our lives, that it is now proposed to supersede by a revised version. It is admitted, on all hands, that there is no defect in our present version that affects in the most minute degree any one article of our Christian faith, or any one principle of our Christian morals. This the advocates of revision are loud and earnest in proclaiming; though, unhappily, they advocate revision with as burning words and fiery energy as if they really thought that all our faith and all our morals depended on it. And, therefore, we may ask, if our present version has no serious defect touching articles of our faith, or principles of our morals, why there should be so earnest an effort to supersede it? And why should we, who know that the religious knowledge and faith and practice of our people is associated with the very words and phrases of our present version,—why should we be asked or compelled to cast it aside as a version no longer worthy of our reverence, as slurred and worthless, condemned by Convocation and rejected by Parliament?

But before all this question of a revised version there stands out before us, like the foreground figures of a picture, the yet greater question of the Texts of the Originals. It must first of all be settled what are those originals which are thus to be translated anew. In the present day, and in the present state of our scholarship, and with our present knowledge of MSS., a revised version, without first settling the Text of the Originals to be translated, would be not only an anachronism, but a blunder; and the great object of the advocates of revision is not a few marginal readings or small corrections, but the revision of the *Textus Receptus*,—the commonly received text of the Greek Testament,—and on that basis producing a revision of our English version.

In determining the text of the Hebrew and Greek originals, all our ordinary scholarship is well-nigh worthless. It may be very humiliating, but not the less true, that the learned dons of our Universities are as little helpful as the idlest boys in our schools. The inquiry is not into moods and tenses and articles on the construction of languages, or familiarity with Hebrew or Greek,—with all this numbers of clergyman are acquainted. All this kind of scholarship would be invaluable in the work of translating, but could never settle the original texts to be translated. This is rather a question for those who are learned in a special school of literary antiquarianism,—for another class of scholars,

Digitized by Google

altogether different from ordinary teachers in our schools and Universities. It is a question of the collation of ancient MSS., of their age, of their value, of their variations, and of the amount of comparative authority to be assigned to each; it is a question as to the collation of ancient versions, especially of those that —like the Peschito, or old Syrian, the old Latin and others—are older than the most ancient MSS. we possess; it is a question as to the collation of the citations of Scripture in the early Fathers, —especially those more ancient than our MSS.,—and ascertaining whether they have or have not been tampered with by the copyists; it is a question as to what words and sentences and whole paragraphs—as the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, and as the greater portion of the last chapter of St. Mark—are to be omitted or retained; it is a question as to whether a disputed passage, like that concerning the three witnesses in 1 John v. 7, 8, had crept into the text from the margin, or had been carelessly omitted by the copyists; or again, whether it was surreptiously introduced by the Trinitarian copyist to give sanction to his views, or insidiously omitted by the Arian, lest it should thwart his opinion, and then was continued in all copies afterwards made. All this constitutes a question that demands a school of scholarship which has very little existence among us.

It is scarcely proposed to revise the text of the Old Testament. There is a significant silence and a mysterious hesitation on that subject, except among a select few, that speaks modestly as to any extended knowledge of Hebrew. There is no necessity, and certainly no propriety in reminding us, that on the whole Bench of Bishops there is as little knowledge of the Hebrew as among an equal number of the clergy in general; but certainly there exist among us very few who are competent for this work. This must at once be admitted among the Bishops. Indeed, where we might have expected some reticence, some things were said facetiously about "favourite texts;" such as, "The Lord our righteousness," and "The desire of all nations;" and what was thus said demonstrated very clearly the incapacity of the facetious speaker for taking part in revising our version. But happily, as to the originals of the Old Testament, the care which the Jews took in preserving the sacred records and their almost superstitious reverence in numbering the very words and letters; and, combined with all this, the extraordinary learning and labour of Kennicot and others, have left little indeed to be accomplished now. There were giants in those days.

Let any one whose time is limited read the amount of ancient MSS. of the Greek, in Horne's "Introduction to the Scriptures;" or, better still, let him read Tregelles "Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, together with a collation of the Critical Texts

Digitized by Google

of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, with that in common use;" and he will there see all the corrections suggested and adopted by these revisers, to the number of more than nine thousand; and he will also see at the same time that our ordinary knowledge of Greek is one thing, and that a knowledge of the lore that enables us to judge of ancient MSS. and the amount of authority due to each, is another; or, as an easier process, let any-one examine Tischendorf's "English New Testament," in the Tauchnitz edition, so lately and so cheaply published with the *variæ lectiones* of the three greatest of the ancient MSS., and he will soon feel how little all his supposed scholarship will help him in determining which of the three is the correct text. He may indeed have his preference for one reading over another, as more in accordance with his own views of Scripture truth; but he will also feel that it requires another department of scholarship altogether to determine between them.

It will be universally felt that a well-revised text of the Greek Testament,—one worthy of superseding our old, old friend, the *Textus Receptus*,—one founded on a wise collation of the ancient MSS. of the most ancient versions, and of the citations in the early Fathers,—would be a most valuable and precious acquisition. Every scholar would welcome it with open arms; every student of Scripture would hail its advent with loud hosannahs. But we ought to have this before we call for a revised version; we ought to settle—at least, with some contentment among ourselves—what we are to translate before we proceed to translate. There have been many attempts at this already. In the present century there have been Griesbach's, and Scholz', and Lachmann's, and Tischendorf's. We may or may not like them; but each of them is the work of a giant. There are also second-rate books, as Bloomfield's, and Alford's, and others; and it may well be hoped that the work now in the hands of Tregelles will surpass them all, and that thus we shall have the most complete and accurate text ever yet made and by the most competent of living men. The greater portion of this book is already printed, and the remainder may be soon expected; but if the Committee of our Bishops can give us a more learned revision, or if the Committee of Convocation can do enough of cackling and hatch a better revision, we shall most cordially wish them "God speed" in a work so valuable.

But it may well be felt—it is the deep conviction of many—that the time is scarcely come for such a work as may supersede the *Textus Receptus*. It was only very lately the Sinaitic MS. came to light; a few years more may bring older and better MSS. to our hands. It is only a few years since the Nitrian MSS.—about 400 in number—were discovered; a few years more

Digitized by Google

may possibly unbury as many more. It is but a short time since some of the Palimpsests yielded their treasures; it is impossible to say how many more are waiting their resurrection. New facilities are opening,—new fields of research are given to us,—new labourers in these fields are multiplying; and more and larger results may well be expected. We may therefore be permitted to doubt whether the time is yet fully come for such a recension of the Greek Testament, as would justify a revision of our English version. It may indeed be, like all human things, imperfect; but it may well be remembered by us that our Blessed Lord and His holy Apostles were content to use the Septuagint, though certainly a very defective version. They thought it sufficient for their great purpose; and we may well be content with our Authorized Version,—an incomparably better one. It is sufficient for our present work; while humbly and expectantly we wait His time to give us more light as to the originals. At all events it took seven years to write our English version: it will certainly take twice seven years to arrange the Hebrew and Greek originals, to say nothing of the seven years more to make a fitting version.

This brings us to the proposed revision of the Authorized Version. We have all known a Unitarian version in England; we have all seen the Roman Catholic version in Ireland; we have all been acquainted with a revised version in America; and we cannot but feel they are all miserable failures. We have also seen those amateur revisions,—one a revision of the Pauline Epistles, published by a dignitary of our Church; and again, a revision of the New Testament, by another dignitary. One was attempted by an association of five self-selected men; and it is not easy for anyone to read these—always excepting the authors themselves—without a sigh of sadness over them as miserable failures, proving one, and one thing only: viz., that their authors are utterly incompetent to revise our Authorized Version.

But it is often argued in favour of revision, that modern scholarship has thrown a vast amount of real and precious light on some of the most difficult places in Holy Scripture, and that it is capable of still more and greater things. Everyone must confess the truth of this. We do owe unbounded gratitude to the Fountain of all light for those beautiful rays of living light thrown on some passages by modern scholarship. Let us with thankful hearts bless the Spirit of light for all this, and pray for more and yet more light. It is most true that our knowledge of Greek is far more exact than in past times; and thus far it would assist us in a revised translation of the New Testament. But it may well be doubted whether our knowledge of Hebrew is as deep or as exact or as general as in former times; and this would

Digitized by Google

impede a revised translation of the Old Testament. Still, however, while taking the most self-complacent views of ourselves and our scholarship, there is yet, we would humbly suggest, something more required in a work like this. A fitting translation of Homer would require not only adequate scholarship, but also something of the poetic *afflatus* of Homer, so as to throw his fire and spirit and power into it. And we may be forgiven if we believe that the minds which would adequately translate the poetic raptures of Isaiah, the sweet songs of David, the subtle reasoning of Paul, and above all, the love and sympathy and holiness breathing in the words of Jesus Christ, must have drunk deeply of that Spirit by whose inspiration they were written. While there must be the most exact scholarship, there must also be the most reverential piety; and feeling as we do,—the absolute and supreme necessity for both of these,—we may well be pardoned if we have anxiety that the work of revising our English version may, perhaps, in some cases be committed to those who possess only one of these qualifications. Scholarship without piety, or piety without scholarship would, though in different ways, be a disastrous failure in the results.

But while thus gratefully and lovingly recognising the beautiful light thrown by modern scholarship on the Holy Scriptures, we must not put a veil upon our eyes. We must not forget that it has also flung a false and lurid light over them. It is modern scholarship, or that which affects to be such, that would persuade us, through the pen of an Anglican Bishop, that the Books of Moses were not written till some centuries after his death; it is modern scholarship has asserted that there are two Isaiahs, one to be believed as little as the other; it is modern scholarship in one of our dignitaries that has discovered that not Jehovah, but the bloody rites of the idolatry of Syria, led the Patriarch Abraham to the proposed sacrifice of his son; it is modern scholarship has taught that the prophecies of Daniel are not prophecies at all, but history written after the events; it is modern scholarship that has discovered that the opening chapter of the Gospel of Luke, giving an account of the incarnation, is an uninspired interpolation; it is modern scholarship has proclaimed that the Gospel of John is a forgery late in the second century. While such sad and saddening things are connected with what goes by the name of modern scholarship, we may well be pardoned if we pause and hesitate and doubt as to the stamp of men to whom it is possible the revision of our Bible may be committed,—whether they will be found to possess the fitting piety as well as the fitting scholarship.

There are some among us who advocate merely the revision of some coarse words and phrases, desiring to soften them down to

Digitized by Google

the level of what some would call a false and a fashionable delicacy. There are some also who only wish for such a re-translation of obscure or difficult passages as might make them more intelligible. There are many who would be content with an increased number of marginal readings that might throw new light on the words. And all these, we believe unintentionally, are throwing the weight of their numbers and character into the ranks of those who are given to change, and who are the real and energetic and muscular advocates of revision. We allude to those who really desire to cast away the *Textus Receptus* altogether; and whose object is to bring our English version into strict conformity with certain MSS. which they admire,—omitting everything which is omitted from this MS., and inserting everything which is contained in that MS.; while they are totally incompetent to form a reliable judgment as to the true authority (if any authority at all) of these MSS. There is a large number of persons, however, who are thoughtful and earnest Christians, who have nothing to do with the radical reformers, and who would be more than content—who would be thankful—for such an edition, not revision, but such an edition of the Scriptures as would give in the margin, or as a note, all the principal and more important of the various readings of the best and most ancient MSS. They do not want all the various readings, for their name is Legion; but all the chief and more important ones. They perhaps are not aware of the fact that all this has been already done to their hand with all possible success: that the edition of our English New Testament, lately edited by Tischendorf, and now sold at the price of one shilling, has accomplished this. By a collation of the three principal MSS. (the Alexandrian, the Vatican, and the Siniatic), and the addition of all their principal variations in foot notes to our English version, every one is at once in possession of all. He sees at a glance all that can reasonably be desired by the ordinary student. And thus having already all we really want, we feel it is far worse than a work of supererogation to press for an authorized revision of our Bible.

It will at once be seen that our objection is not to a revision, but to an authorized or authoritative revision. Our objection is not to revision in the abstract: men can make as many revisions as they like, and as many translations as they please. They do not require the sanction of the House of Lords or of the House of Commons to do this; they do not need a Royal Commission to accomplish this; they require no Act of Parliament to enable them to do this: they have all this right in themselves already; and they are perfectly free to exercise this right, both how and when they please. They can continue to do what many others

Digitized by Google

have done already. What we object to is, that authority should be given to anyone,—by the Crown or by Parliament, by the Church or by the State,—to impose their revision or their translation of the Bible upon us, who perhaps may feel that "the old is better;" or to compel us to read their revision or translation in the services of our Church, if we feel "the old is better." This they are fully aware cannot be done without an Act of Parliament; and it is this they are aiming at in all their proceedings. While they profess merely a desire for a revision, which they have full freedom to accomplish when they please, they are aiming at an Act of Parliament to compel us to adopt their revision. The foremost advocate for revision, one who has himself published a revision of the whole New Testament, has thus expressed himself:—

"His wish mainly is to keep open the great question of an *authoritative* revision, to show the absolute necessity of such a measure sooner or later, and to disabuse men's minds of the fallacies by which the *Authorized* Version is commonly defended."

Again:—

"The reviser has only to express his wish and prayer that this work may be as soon as possible rendered useless by the more matured and multifarious labour of a Royal Commission. Such a Commission he believes the various sections of the Church in this realm fully able to furnish with members: and he doubts not that its issue would be a New *Authorized* Version founded on the Old; but everyway, by its own weight of excellence, superseding it."

This language, implying that the Authorized Version is to give way to an authoritative version, shows that the design contemplates a version which will be made authoritative. We may have our doubts whether even an Act of Parliament could do that, but at all events this language shows a desire for authority; and it is not easy to understand why the subject was so prominently introduced into the Legislature, unless in contemplation of invoking the power of the Legislature.

The Bishops have power to revise the Hebrew and the Greek whenever they please. The Convocation has power to translate and retranslate as often as it will. Every clergyman and layman has power, if he pleases, to revise or retranslate the Scriptures. Then why was this question raised so pertinaciously, not of theology, but of legislation? If the idea or purpose was to obtain the sanction of the Crown to a Royal Commission, or to obtain an Act of Parliament to impose some revised version on us, then their procedure was perfectly intelligible. We protest against this in the name of the Church of England, in the name of the Nonconformists of England, and in the name of the Christians

Digitized by Google

of America. We say, especially for ourselves, without doubt or hesitation, we will not part with our inherent right of private judgment,—to judge for ourselves whether the work be correctly or scholarly done. We have not faith in their scholarship, we have not faith in their peculiar views of Christianity, to trust them with such power. We would not cast a shade on their sincerity. We assume them to be as sincere as ourselves, as zealous for their views of truth, and as self-sacrificing for its maintenance. We are willing to elevate them as far higher than ourselves for all these graces; but a Royal Commission for the revision of the Scriptures, like that which sat on the Lectionary and Rubrics and Rites in the Prayer-book,—a Commission composed of the leaders of Ritualism on one hand, and the leaders of Rationalism on the other, and the friends of Evangelical truth all but absolutely excluded, would be a dark disaster, as well as a gross injustice to the Church of Christ in this land.

The mere fact of a new version coming from a Royal Commission, would tend in some minds to give it the brand of emanating from State authority. Such a Bible would be exposed to the danger of being pronounced a State Bible, in the same way as our Church is rejected as a State Church; and thus it would be doubtful how it might be received among not only our own congregations, but among those of the Dissenters, as coming only with the authority of the Church or the State, to supersede our present Bible, which comes with all the sanction of an antiquity of two centuries and a half. Our present version was left to work its own way, and it was many long years before it superseded all its previous competitors; and any further version or revision must be left to its own merits to work its way in like manner. It has been arranged, in order to obviate any schism among us as to the universal reception of the new version, that some of the divines of the Nonconforming Churches should be placed on the Royal Commission. The justice of such a procedure is apparent enough, but we apprehend that it may possibly interfere with the harmony of the revisors. At all events it would be an obstacle to the introduction, or rather the retention of certain words or terms, that in deference to Royal authority, rather than to true scholarship, have found place in our present version. The Greek ἐκκλησία, when applied in the Septuagint to the Jews, is translated "congregation;" and when applied in the Acts of the Apostles to the meetings of the heathen, it is three times rendered "assembly;" but whenever applied to the Christians, it is translated "Church." It seems inevitable that the last of these terms would be in danger of entire exclusion from a revision. And so, too, with the word "Bishop," which certainly is no adequate translation of ἐπίσκοπος,

Digitized by Google

a term which both in Acts xx. 18 and in Titus i. 7, is expressive of the office of presbyter, rather than of the office which is understood among us to constitute the Church of England an episcopal Church. There are other matters, too, on which the most "colourless" Commission, which means a Commission of all colours, would find it very difficult to preserve harmony of version.

To conclude, there is no need to speculate how the more than twenty millions of copies of our present version now in circulation in these islands, to say nothing of our Colonies and America, are to be superseded, and their places supplied by the revised version. But in a matter of such grave consequences, affecting the whole religious life, affections, and associations of the Christianity of these lands, we may well be pardoned if we have very strong misgivings as to the work of a revision, considered in itself, and still more if we feel doubts as to the qualifications, in a religious aspect, of those persons to whose hands such a work might be confided as members of a Royal Commission. We may not have the desirable confidence (we avow it) in the impartiality or the judgment of those with whom the selection would rest; and as to the appointment of a Committee, whether of the Upper or Lower Houses of Convocation, or of both combined, we cannot profess any great measure of confidence in those who possess the power of nominating the members. But in any case, we protest with both hands, not indeed against their making as many versions as they please, but against any authority from the Crown or from the Parliament, from the Church or from the State, to impose their revision on us, so as to substitute it for our old, our venerable and venerated version, which we have heard with our ears, and seen with our eyes, and handled with our hands, and felt with our hearts, from our early childhood to our hoar hairs. It has been blessed to millions in the past, and we will pray that it may still be blessed to millions in the future.

M. Hobart Seymour.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Holy Angels: their Nature and Employments, as Recorded in the Word of God. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875. —A very interesting subject handled in a most reverent and judicious manner. To many there would have been strong temptation, notwithstanding the cautions suggested by St. Paul, to have

Digitized by Google

intruded into things which the writer had not seen, "vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind." There might, again, especially at this crisis, have been a subtle attempt to make meditation upon angelic beings the vehicle for introducing fresh heresies, by inculcating "a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels." From all these blemishes the volume is quite free. It will be found convenient, as all relating to angels in Scripture is gathered together, so that the whole subject is presented to the reader in a plain and consecutive arrangement. The writer's own comments, partly original, partly selected from learned men who have written concerning angels, are conspicuous for sobriety of thought and holy reverence: they will be found useful for edification. It is noticed that there is "no record of an angel appearing in the form of a woman." Angels are generally represented "as beauteous females, in our popular pictures and engravings;" but, as the author judiciously observes, "the thoughtful student of the intimations of Holy Scripture will see at once the unfitness of the angels who are a "creation separate from and independent of man, appearing in the human female form." This is one of the manifold instances in which the creations of human art distort and misrepresent the teaching of the Bible, substituting human fancy for Divine revelation, and so inculcating error.

On the Communion Office: a Commentary Expository and Devotional. By E. M. Goulburn, D.D., Dean of Norwich. Sixth edition. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875.—When a book has been twelve years before the world, and has passed through six editions, the office of the critic becomes almost a superfluity. Popular approval has displayed itself in an unmistakable manner, and there would be little use in calling its verdict into question, even if it were needful. As might be expected, the views of Dr. Goulburn on the subject of the Lord's Supper are those of a High Churchman, expressed in the most unequivocal manner, but without any sympathy with the gross superstitions with which the Sacrament is now depraved and degraded almost into a sort of fetich, by too many. There is much that is useful and edifying in the statements which he has propounded; there is also a good deal with which we cannot sympathize. If at times his assertions are not positively erroneous, yet they might, we think, easily become subservient to error. We could not, therefore, commend Dr. Goulburn as a safe guide upon this important question, although we can bear willing testimony to the holy and reverent spirit which pervades his volume. In the appendix to the present edition he discusses Fasting Communion, Non-Communicating Attendance, and Auricular Confession; practices which he condemns in guarded language, which will carry much weight with many, proceeding as it does from one who certainly would not be forward to protest against any usage calculated to enhance reverence for the Holy Communion.

The Phenomena of Spiritualism. By the Rev. Asa Mahan, D.D., First President of Oberlin College, Ohio. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.—This is a strange book, upon a very strange subject. In its pages the author investigates in a very exhaustive

Digitized by Google

manner the professed wonders of Spiritualism. In his conclusion he declares, "We have examined its high claims, and found them empty and vain. We have scrutinized the facts set forth as the basis of the system, and found them wholly mundane in their character, and presenting no evidence of a super-mundane origin." In this conclusion most sober-minded and intelligent persons, even without investigation, probably concur. He attributes the singular phenomena which are produced by adepts to what he terms odylic force, "a polar force not yet distinctly recognised in philosophy; a force having, when developed, very strong, attractive, and repulsive powers; a force, the direction of whose action, when certain conditions are fulfilled, accords with mental states, and is determined by the same; a force, finally through which the mental states of our mind may be reproduced in others, and thus embodied, as in these communications." The delusion of Spiritualism prevails much more extensively in America than it does in England; still it is not without its votaries amongst ourselves. We know that it works much detriment, and where accepted is most fatally subversive of religion in its victims. Any attempt, therefore, like Dr. Mahan's, to grapple with the subject, and expose the spurious claims of Spiritualists, deserves commendation. We could not wish any to take the book up for the purpose of gratifying idle curiosity, for the danger is great when men, vainly puffed up by a fleshly mind, intrude into things which they have not seen; but where there is a necessity, it might be employed to dissipate phantasies which lead some to become the victims of artful impostors, and others, we fear, to make shipwreck of their salvation. Many of the lying wonders of the Church of Rome, as well as the phenomena of witchcraft, necromancy, fortune telling, etc., might find their explanation in the author's theory, which is, to say the least, very plausible and fairly argued.

Twelve Months in Madagascar. By Joseph Mullens, D.D. London: Nisbet. 1875.—The interest attaching to Madagascar is unabated, and until recent untoward events missions there could be contemplated by all Protestant Christians with unmixed sympathy and satisfaction. There might be room both for extension and improvement; but it would have seemed right to leave those who through so much tribulation had successfully carried on a noble work to consolidate and perfect it without needless interference. In our judgment, the recent establishment of an Episcopal Mission, upon the principles professed by its promoters, is a most painful evidence of a spirit of sacerdotal aggression, more befitting the arrogancy of Rome than what is Scriptural (Rom. xv. 20) and truly catholic. With much good feeling and good taste Dr. Mullens has touched but lightly on this most unpleasant subject, which he could not altogether avoid. His volume, therefore, will be read with pleasure by all, affording as it does much fresh and interesting information about the interior of the island. The Deputation of the Society had singular facilities afforded them for enlarging and correcting our knowledge of the country, and they have clearly made good use of them. It is not only the student of missions, but those who are

Digitized by Google

interested in geographical and scientific pursuits who will welcome Dr. Mullens' volume. The glimpses of missionary life will be found attractive by all classes of readers. The book is a very welcome and valuable addition to our mission literature.

Robert Forrester. By Mary Thompson. London: Longmans. 1875. —This is, what the author terms it, a "novel." We are bound to say that in the composition of it she has not called into her aid murder, and the other foul ingredients which make many modern novels a disgrace to our literature. But beyond this negative praise we have not much commendation, if any, to bestow. Passion, not principle, and that passion love, actuates the characters introduced. There is no wholesome lesson inculcated; there is no moral in the tale. It is reasonably free from extravagant diction and repulsive sentiments. There is, moreover, a certain amount of ability displayed by the author; but the work is not of a nature calculated either to interest or to profit our readers.

Pastoral Theology. By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D. Edinburgh: Clark. 1875.—This treatise on the office and duties of a Christian pastor, by the late Professor Fairbairn, is well deserving thoughtful perusal. There are, of course, portions of it which are adjusted to the meridian of Presbyterianism, such for instance as the mode of conducting public prayer, which will be of little value to the English reader. Throughout the volume, however, there is a tone of earnest piety and practical good sense, which finds expression in many profitable counsels, embodying the result of large experience and shrewd observation. The chapters which treat of the nature of the pastoral office, and of the pastoral and social life of the pastor, contain much calculated to awake serious reflection, and are most wisely and judiciously framed. Much of the volume is devoted to the theory and practice of preaching, and this part we can most heartily commend; it is replete with valuable suggestions, which even those who have had some experience in the ministry will find calculated to make them more attractive and efficient preachers. It is worth noting, that Dr. Fairbairn maintains that in the art of public speaking the ancients are our best guides, and that there is scarcely anything of moment, nothing certainly entitled to much consideration, which will not be found, both lucidly stated and largely illustrated, in the rhetorical treatises of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. And yet these most important works are almost wholly neglected in our public schools, our universities, and our training colleges. Probably the large mass of preachers, both in and out of the Church, have never seen Quintilian, much less read it. When we came to the topic of public prayer, we must confess after we had read Dr. Fairbairn's hints, sensible as they are, our feeling was one of extreme thankfulness that we possess our Liturgy. When, again, we came to the parts treating of catechetical instruction and the administration discipline, it was quite manifest that the Church of England is not the only body which has difficulties to struggle against well nigh insuperable; her system is not perfect, and in her Communion Service she deplores it, but other Churches have their difficulties also. The stool of repentance, "placed nearly

Digitized by Google

in front of the pulpit," has become nearly as obsolete as the stocks in England, and apparently there has been nothing to replace it. An interesting sketch of Dr. Fairbairn's life, by the Rev. James Dodds, is prefixed to the volume.

The Women of India and Christian Work in the Zenana. By Mrs. Weitbrecht. London: Nisbet. 1875.—We most earnestly commend to our readers this most interesting volume, which will be a most welcome addition to our Missionary literature. The contents of the book have already appeared in German periodicals, but this fact does not interfere with freshness and value to English readers. Mrs. Weitbrecht modestly terms it a "a compilation consecutively arranged." We are much indebted to her for it. In a brief compass there is a fairly complete survey of the condition of the women in India, from the earliest times to the present, and a record of Christian effort on their behalf; with short biographies of those holy women who have devoted themselves to the blessed work of introducing the light of the Gospel, with all its regenerating and sanctifying influences, into the darkness and misery of Hindu homes. "One so rarely sees a merry woman," is the report of a Zenana visitor: when on the occasion of her visit she saw some bright and merry, she termed it "a new phase of native life." For Missionary working parties it will be a most acceptable book, well calculated to awaken intelligent interest in those on whose behalf these labours of love are undertaken. We trust it will obtain extensive circulation.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

DURING the past month the progress of legislation has been steady, although not marked with circumstances of peculiar interest in either House of Parliament. When taking the vote for Education, in the Committee of Supply, Lord Sandon was enabled to report that school accommodation had been provided since 1870 for a million more children. There ought to be four million and a half of children in attendance, but at present not much above a million and a half attend upon an average. Without compulsion much more strictly enforced than it is at present, this average will probably not be much exceeded, nor will regularity of attendance, which is so important, be secured. How far this compulsion would be borne by the mass of the people is a very serious question. The Bills relating to labour, introduced by the Home Secretary with a view of adjusting the relative interests of employers and workmen, have been discussed at length, and bid fair to become law. It would be a great public gain if these irritating questions could find a satisfactory solution, considerate to all, and protecting the workman against the tyranny of his own class. There is some prospect that this will be promoted by recent legislation. How

Digitized by Google

far a similar result will flow from the "Agricultural Holdings Bill," in settling the relations between landlord and tenant, seems more doubtful: very grave differences of opinion have been elicited in the course of the debates upon it. Upon the intimation made by Mr. D'Israeli that in order to pass it it would be necessary to withdraw the "Merchant Shipping Bill," a most painful scene occurred in the House. Mr. Plimsoll, with extreme violence, denounced what he maintained had been underhand practices to secure its rejection, and declaimed with much warmth against the preference given to property over life, by the postponement of a measure calculated to protect our seamen, and exposing them to the storms of another winter without the protection which legislation could afford. If to be "zealously affected in a good thing is good" it is impossible to withhold sympathy from Mr. Plimsoll, whose advocacy of the lives of our seamen is unquestionably pure and disinterested, although his violence was unjustifiable.

It is with profound sorrow we have again to record that our Government still refuses to withdraw from the cultivation and manufacture of opium. Of the immoral and injurious character of this traffic there can be no question. It is deplorable to feel that we are as a nation responsible for it in the sight of God, through the action of our authorities at home and in India. What is indefensible on moral grounds must be inexpedient on financial, although apparently not so; in this particular instance our relations with China have been complicated with this question in a most disastrous manner.

The Public Worship Facilities Bill has been withdrawn.

It is hardly possible to record with indifference that Courts of Justice which have existed among us for a thousand years have sat for the last time. The Court of King's Bench and the Court of Common Pleas have now closed their doors, and the Court of Exchequer will, in November, likewise be merged in the new Supreme Court. The vast extension of our Empire, bringing with it corresponding increase of business, public and private, has given rise to so much increase of litigation that the proposed change in our judicature is salutary and necessary.

In the *Contemporary Review* Mr. Gladstone has published an article on the question whether the Church of England is worth preserving; the scope and tendency of it is to shield Ritualists from the penalities of the Public Worship Regulation Act. The writer attempts to argue that the eastward position and vestments have no doctrinal significance. This preposterous assertion has met with a timely and crushing rejoinder from Dean Howson. The Lower House of Convocation has presented a string of resolutions to the Upper House, advocating diversity of practice in the posture of the minister at the Lord's Supper. The Upper

Digitized by Google

House with much good sense quietly shelved them. In the opinion of the *Saturday Review* "the results of the recent debates in Convocation must be totally unintelligible to anyone who measures its action by the literal analogy of Parliament." With this opinion we concur. There have been some fanatical demonstrations at St. Alban's, Holborn, consequent on the suspension of Mr. Mackonochie.

During the last month there have been most disastrous floods and convulsions of nature. In France, more especially in the southern districts around Toulouse, and in Hungary, there has been much devastation of property, stated at £15,000,000 in the district of Toulouse, and considerable loss of life, estimated at nine hundred. In South America there has been a terrible earthquake, destroying the city of Cuenta, with other cities, and numerous villages on the borders of Columbia and Venezuela. Five hundred persons are supposed to have perished in Cuenta. Although in England we have been mercifully preserved from these wholesale disasters, there have been torrents of rain, causing in many parts extensive floods, and seriously destroying the hay harvest, as well as injuring the growing corn. It has been in many quarters a period of fearful national calamity.

There have been disquieting rumours about the relations of Russia and Prussia, and stories have been rife about intrigues of the former power with Austria; much credence cannot, however, be attached to them. From France there is apparently no prospect of the immediate dissolution of the present Assembly. One important result of the recent religious disturbances in Belgium has been that several most eminent leaders of the Liberal party have embraced Protestantism; among them, M. Frère-Orban. In Spain the Carlists have suffered severe reverses. The Sultan of Zanzibar has left England for Paris. Earnest endeavours were made during his stay to arouse him to the enormities connected with East African slavery. We notice with much satisfaction that some success has attended effort to induce the Portuguese to suppress this iniquitious traffic in their colonies in the Mozambique. If this could be effected, a great blow would be inflicted upon this giant evil. In the United States public attention has been concentrated on the New York city frauds, and upon Mr. Beecher, whose guilt has been "not proven."

From Burmah the intelligence is unsatisfactory. In accordance with the traditional policy of this Court, the King promised all while Sir D. Forsyth was present, but on his departure was as unwilling as ever to concede what was required of him.

The ex-Emperor of Austria, Professor Cairns, and Lady Franklin are dead. Robert Owen, the once notorious Socialist, a believer in Spiritualism, has become hopelessly insane in consequence of the exposure of the delusions to which he had been subjected.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 9. SEPTEMBER. [1875.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

WITH REFERENCE TO THE

CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DAY.

THE Christian Ministry constitutes the living link between two worlds,—the world seen and the world unseen, the world of sense and the world of faith. I use these phrases in their broadest meaning. By the seen world of sense, I mean the whole earthly and secular life, including not only the material framework of the world, but its constitutional order, social and political, and its Providential government; all, in short, that does not enter distinctively into the province of religion. By the unseen world, I mean the entire province of religion, of which faith is the organ of apprehension. I include not only the invisible beings who crowd the universe with life, and fill it with ceaseless praise, and whom the mechanical limitations of the human eye and ear make us at present incapable of perceiving, but likewise God's dealings in the past, in the work and office of His Son; His operations in the present, in the influences of the Holy Ghost; and His intentions in the future, in the establishment of the promised kingdom of universal righteousness and peace. The two worlds touch everywhere, but everywhere in contrast. The living, personal, visible bond of union between them is the Christian Ministry.

This Ministry is itself related to both worlds. It belongs to the seen world by its personnel; for the abstract ideal of the office only takes shape in the persons who exercise it, and these persons are mortal men, themselves in need of the salvation that they preach, and sharing all the weaknesses, sympathies, and associations of those to whom they preach. The deep wisdom which has bound up the salvation of men with the ministry of men, opens a rich and tempting field of thought into which I

Digitized by Google

must not step. But the Ministry is related to the seen world not alone by the sympathy of the individuals, but by the nature of the office. Its object has reference to the present disciplinary state, and to the practical conditions of human life. It works by an outward organization, and by visible means, ordinances, and sacraments, all adapted to the two sides of human nature, and to the purposes of that redemption, which includes both the body and the soul in the present sanctification and the future glory of the saints. I do not say but that in that future world there may be a Ministry still, and it may be high among the delights of the saints of the present dispensation to minister like angels to other globes; but it will be so, because we shall not become spirits in the world of glory, nor cease to retain the outward bodies, of which our Lord's body of glory in heaven is the risen first-fruits. Thus the Ministry is related to the seen world both by the humanity of the individuals, and by the very purpose of its constitution.

But it is related equally to the unseen world, for both its appointment and its work are of God. Its authority is not its own, but His, and this by an identity so absolute that we are said to do what God does. We are His ambassadors, and in this sense His representatives. I say in this sense, because while the office of ambassadors suggests the solemn dignity and honour of our calling, it equally dissipates the groundless claims to exercise by delegation the actual prerogatives of God, which the pride of office has unhappily engendered. For the prerogatives of kingship are inseparable from the person of kings, and no ambassador is invested with them, nor can step one jot beyond the special work, and the specific instructions with which he is commissioned. Directly he exceeds them, the delegated authority passes from him. The Christian Ministry is the representative of God only in the special office intrusted to it, of ministering in the Word and Sacraments. It is the voice crying in the wilderness the warnings of the world unseen. It is the witness of God and of His salvation, and the only living witness to man. No doubt there are countless thousands of blessed spirits who would delight to break through the veil separating the two worlds, as they were permitted to do at the Nativity, and to become preachers of the Gospel to mankind; but the honour and happiness of such a work are not permitted to them. To our human ears heaven is silent, for though its voices are sounding on every side of us, the dull earthly senses cannot catch their accents. Men alone are permitted to minister to men. Through them and by them alone is audible message sent to us. By lips stammering in human weakness, and tongues familiar with the sobs of human agony, are sounded the admonitions of

Digitized by Google

the world unseen, alike in the great and strong wind that rends the very rocks with the convictions of the Spirit, the earthquake that warns us of the supremacy of His judgments, and the still small sweet voice that witnesses of His love.

Thus related to both worlds, it seems evident that the Christian ministry must partake of the character of both. It must be conditioned by the unseen as well as by the seen. Neither must be omitted, least of either the unseen. It is impossible rightly to adjust the relation of the Christian Ministry to the circumstances of the day, without considering its relation to God at the same time. A man invents a machine so skilfully adapted to perform some familiar act, that its steel fingers appear almost to be intelligent. He adapts it to the circumstances of the day, to economise labour in some branch of industry. The use and purpose are occasional; but in accomplishing them the inventor only uses those natural forces which have abided from the beginning, which human skill may employ, but can never violate, and can only forget at the peril of its life. So the Christian ministry must meet the claims of the day by a wise adaptation of its general organization to existing wants, and of its special methods to the mental and moral habitudes of its generation. But the area of these modifications must be strictly limited by the commission we have received, and the powers with which alone we have been entrusted. The Christian Ministry must partake of the character of both worlds; but we need to recognise the point of their union, and the modes in which the one must modify the other.

Now the seen world and the unseen are contrasted in many points, but to one point only shall I call attention. I refer to the flux and change and endless mutabilities characteristic of the one, and to the fixity, certainty, and unchangeableness which constitute the prerogatives of the other. When we have once ascertained what parts of the Christian ministry bear the characteristic of the seen, and what part the characteristic of the unseen, the subject discussed in this paper will already have received its answer, and we shall have before us the Christian Ministry in its principles, with special reference to the circumstances of the day.

Let me give priority where absolute supremacy is due, and see in the first place how the Ministry is conditioned by its relation to the fixity and unchangeableness of the unseen.

I begin with the primal fact that God Himself is changeless. In His cloudless Being there is no variableness, neither the shadow of a turning. This is involved in the very idea of a God, and in the calm "now" of His eternal Being. We cannot understand this. We are wholly incapable of conceiving what

Digitized by Google

eternity is. Our highest effort is to know what it is not. It evidently is not succession. Succession, however indefinitely we may prolong it, is palpably human,—of the earth, and earthly. There can be no succession in the Eternal. Therefore the very logical conception of Him excludes all change; and this appears to extend not only to the Being and nature of God, but likewise to His will and purposes. They may take effect in time, but the seat of them in the Divine mind is in eternity. Their manifestation towards us may be in succession, but they themselves must be like Him who forms them, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The solemn assurances of Scripture only confirm this necessary conclusion of the reason. The plan of God towards man began in the eternity before time, "*according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.*" It occupies all time, for time is but the process of its fulfilment, and it will have its consummation in the eternity after time. There are, there can be, no after-thoughts with God. What He designs once He designs ever, and it is inconceivable that His purposes should either change or fail. No one of the elements out of which arise alterations in human design, have therefore any place in God. Here is absolute certainty, fixity, unchangeableness. We look up, as in nature we look sometimes to the skies above our heads. The terrene atmosphere is full of driving clouds. Their huge masses, with the jagged edges of them lurid with secret fire, move with portentous slowness, or rush headlong with furious winds. But all the turmoil belongs to ourselves. Look through those broken clouds: how far above smiles the cloudless blue, looking down in its calm repose on the struggling storms below it! So it is when we look up to God. The endless shift and change surround us on every side, but there with Him they die away into everlasting repose. "*The floods have lifted up, O Lord; the floods have lifted up their voice. The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea.*"

The thought is full of comfort. But the question occurs, how far is the immutability of God transferred to the Ministry which witnesses of Him? The Ministry derives its work and authority from God, but what is the mode of communication between it and Him? Is the Ministry in direct and immediate communication with God, as were the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, and the glorious company of the Apostles,—like Moses, with whom God spoke as a man speaketh with his friend; and Paul, who was able to say, "The Gospel which was preached after me was not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ"? or does it receive His will indirectly, and through some other appointed

Digitized by Google

means? We must answer that the communication is indirect and mediate, and that it is made either through the written Scriptures, or is dependent upon them, and can be certified to us by no other mode.

I. As to revelation, in its proper sense of the making known of truth which could not be made known to us through the process of human discerning, we have the one revelation contained in the written Word of God and no other, and are directly taught not to expect any other. There is no school of religious thought, so far as I know, which professes to receive a revelation, or to be in such direct relation to God as to receive from Him a supernatural explanation of His will. Those who discard the Christian revelation have no other for which they can profess to claim this character. No one claims a revelation, however confidently they may claim the sufficiency of man to discover all the truth they need to know for life and godliness. And there is one thing about this asserted sufficiency of human discovery, which has not received, in my opinion, the attention it deserves. I refer to the palpable fact that in the whole circle of religious belief, whether orthodox or otherwise, there is not to be found one solitary truth dependent on any other authority than the Word of God. What is positively believed to be true, is all to be found there. This is the case, as I have pointed out elsewhere, with the Pantheist, the Theist, the Transcendentalist, the Optimist, the Rationalist, the Unitarian, the Universalist, and the Latitudinarian. In each case the distinctive principle of the system is to be found in the Word of God. They differ from each other, and from us, in the amount they reject out of the Word of God, but they all accept something from it. The Pantheist accepts from it the universality of Divine life and energy which pervades the universe. The Theist accepts the Divine Personality. The Transcendentalist accepts the inherent dignity and greatness of human nature. The Optimist accepts its onward progress and final glorification. The Rationalist accepts the province and use of the reason. The Unitarian accepts the perfect humanity of Christ. The Universalist accepts the future triumph of righteousness, and the Latitudinarian, the dogmas of human sin and atonement, however much he may weaken and dilute them. There is not one solitary truth in the whole circle of positive religious belief, which is not to be found in the inspired pages of the Word. Thus if we look for revelation, there is one and one only source of it, viz., the sacred volume of the Holy Bible. New truths we can have none; for we have no source whence we can receive them by revelation; and should discovery be supposed to find them out, there would be no conceivable mode of authentication: that is, we never could know that they were true.

Digitized by Google

II. As to illumination,—the teaching of the human understanding, conscience, and heart out of the wisdom of Deity, this we believe that we have direct and individual. We devoutly hold, as a grand fundamental principle, the personal contact of God Himself with the soul, and of the soul with God. It is the most distinctive of all our Protestant principles. Conviction, conversion, justification, and sanctification are all the results of it. God the Holy Ghost directly and personally by His own immediate operations awakens the conscience, pours the life of Christ into the soul, and conveys to it unceasingly the grace, virtue, and energy, both of the death and of the life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here therefore we have direct communication with God. But then we must bear in mind that this is not peculiar to the Ministry, either in kind or in degree, but is shared by ministers with all the converted people of God. Further we must bear in mind that our Protestant belief in personal and inward religion is founded on God's own revealed intentions thus to deal with us. Further yet, in looking at the mingled influences that act on us and their mingled results, we are only able to distinguish what is of God and what is not of God, by this unaltering standard of the Word. Different men differ widely in their convictions on points of doctrine, and in their modes of sentiment, and they all equally claim for them a divine illumination. How shall the conflicting claims be decided but by the Scriptures? "*Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.*" I think we have too much forgotten this, and have allowed discredit to be consequently thrown on the great and precious truth of the inward witness. You must not judge by your own subjective feelings. I ask, why not? so long as those feelings and results are confirmed to be of Divine teaching by the objective standard of the written Word. Thus with the soul's inward illumination by the Spirit of God, we do not lose our dependence on the one fixed revelation of the written Word.

III. But, once more, how does it stand in regard to the Ministry itself, its credentials, and the character of the office? The Ministry is not a mere matter of human convenience and social arrangement; at least, I for one believe that it is not. It is an ordinance appointed by Christ; and it appears to me to be specially necessary for us, who are Evangelicals, not to lose hold of this truth. But if it be an ordinance, we cannot make it what we like. It must be directed to the objects and discharged in the mode commanded by Him who has ordained it. But how do we know this? God does not speak out of the heavens and make His will known just as each occasional detail calls for it. Again, we know it solely by the Word. I am not unconscious of the attempt of Rome and of her sympathizers

Digitized by Google

wherever they may be, to establish certain axioms relative to universality, catholicity, and visibility, by which to prove the authority of the Church, on such a basis that even the Bible itself may derive its authority from her, and not she her authority from the Bible. But the very proofs need themselves to be proved, and even then are not verified by history. I must not be tempted aside into this argument. Testimonials given by a Church to herself are among the most worthless of documents. It is enough that according to the principles of the Church of England, we who are ministers of the Church of England must find our credentials in the Canonical Scriptures. Many questions arise here which also I must pass by. I only add, that whether we would test a Ministry or a Church in general, or the claims of an individual to be a faithful steward of the mysteries of Christ, we have no fixed standard of them but the Word. "*To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*"

Now the written revelation is a fixed quantity. We dare not take away from it, and there are no inspired Apostles living to add to it. Within the two covers of our Bible lies the whole will of God, so far as we shall ever know it, short of the cloudless land. We are shut up to obedience to it; and it seems to me that when we attempt to wander away on either side, we are peremptorily driven back to it, lest we lose our way hopelessly and perish in the darkness. Must we not recognise in this condition the fixity of God. The Word is like Himself: unchanged and unchanging as He over whose cloudless being there passeth not the shadow of a turning. Thus on the side of the unseen world the Ministry is limited by conditions, inherent in its very constitution, and which it must not dare to violate. Its very essence is its relation to the unseen world; and its paramount obligation is fidelity in presenting to the faith of mankind its spiritual realities. But this unseen world is changeless, and the Ministry which witnesses to it must evidently partake of the unchangeableness of that to which it witnesses, or else it becomes no more like the reality than the reflection of the driving clouds upon the surface of the lake is like the changeless blue of the overarching sky.

But if such be the relation of the Christian Ministry towards the unseen world, it remains that we examine its relation to the seen world likewise. Here we pass from the sphere of the certain and the eternal, into the sphere of the uncertain and the temporary; we descend into clouds and mists and fogs and ceaseless fluctuation and vicissitude. Imperfection is the characteristic of the seen, and progress and change are its condition. Restless motion is every where, as if we look at a spreading sea, which is

Digitized by Google

a movement through every solitary drop of its multitudinous waters. The head grows giddy and the heart sick with the universal shift and flux. From the material globe itself, up through the life of individual man to the fortunes of an aggregated humanity, it is the same everywhere. Manners, habits, opinions, tendencies, knowledge, are all in movement. Change, fluctuation, unfixity, and unrest, constitute the universal law,—a sea tossed by opposite tides, driven by conflicting winds, and chequered with ten thousand shifting lights and shadows, ebbing and flowing ever, and beating with its restless waves on the calm shore, or dashing itself to pieces against the changeless rocks, of the world unseen.

And yet even here we must draw a distinction. There are two sides even to the seen, one which is turned upward towards God, one which is turned inward and around to itself. On the side which touches the unseen, the awful unchangeableness of which I have already spoken passes over it, and variation dies away in conditions, on which no lapse of time or alteration of circumstances can throw the shadow of a change. Thus the constitution of human nature itself alters not. It is just the same now as it was in the first man, before six thousand years began to roll their tides of change and chance over the race. Its powers and faculties have received no enlargement: its knowledge is subject to the same limitations; its intellect works under the same conditions. Man himself is identically the same now as when he came first from his Creator's hands, and has probably neither lost nor gained one solitary faculty. The same thing is true of his moral condition as of his mental constitution. The records of all history prove this identity: whether they be found in the pages of the sacred narrative, or the uncertain fragments of early history, or in the shattered monuments of ages long dead and buried, but which find a voice in mouldering inscriptions and broken cylinders and half-defaced paintings. The mankind who built the stupendous cities on the Nile, and have written their greatness in Karnak and Luxor and Thebes, and the mankind who worshipped before the winged and man-headed divinities of Nineveh, or who reared the magnificence of voluptuous Babylon, or who corrupted the world with the sensuality of Greece, or ruled with the iron hand of Rome, has been the self-same mankind as the men of the nineteenth century. They fought, and laughed, and wept, and struggled, and suffered, and lived, and died just as we do ourselves. All the outward conditions may alter; but on man himself has passed the awful shadow of his Creator's immutability. The very changes of his mortality only throws into contrast the unchanged identity of his nature.

But as man is himself the same, so his spiritual wants are the

Digitized by Google

same also. He is conscious of the same immortality, is exercised by the same great problems of life and death, feels the same dim searching after something greater and nobler than he has reached, and is drawn by the same solemn consciousness towards the unseen world, of which he feels the attraction but is unable of himself to discover the secrets. This we know from the history of the ancient philosophies. Men have probably thought ever since they lived, and have been occupied by much the same speculations about themselves and God, from the first dawn of philosophical inquiry; but in the ages immediately preceding Christ, the misery got into the heart of a pining humanity, and it actually lifted up its voice and cried aloud.

And, once more, if human nature be the same alike in its constitution, its corruption and its wants, so its relation towards God must necessarily be the same likewise. Creaturehood is still creaturehood ever, and under all states. The same duties, obligations, and responsibilities attach to it, and do not cease because they are unknown, forgotten, or denied. They too arise from the unchangeableness of the unseen, and share in its character. The ideas of duty and of judgment are universal, and have ever been recognised more or less, from the blinded conscience of the savage up to the full light and knowledge of the Christian. It has never been man alone, but ever man and God.

Thus it appears that in regard to human nature itself, the reach of change is limited. It is only superficial, and affects the external relations of man, not man himself. It catches the eye all the more because it is external and forced upon the senses. On the surface is an infinite variety; but when we search below, we find unity, identity, immobility. It is like the surface of the material globe, either dark with the recesses of primeval forest, or bright with the beauty of garden and meadow and golden cornfield, or sparkling with the colours and activities of modern civilization; but let the surface look how it may, the solid structure of the globe itself is all the same. Whether the wilderness is trodden by the solitary savage or made musical with the sounds of happy industry, the tides of the restless sea, and the deep foundations of the everlasting hills abide nevertheless. So it is with humanity at large: the surface varies, but beneath it is the same. In all therefore that enters into the essence and substance of the Christian Ministry, there can be no change even here. The duty to be discharged continues to be identical; it is the method of discharging it which alone can vary: the end and object, the message and the influence are fixed, but the adaptations of the instrumentality may be infinite.

I make no attempt to analyze the circumstances of the day, or to array in a methodical statement its special peculiarities. This

Digitized by Google

has been often done, and the picture will be too familiar to the personal experience of all clergymen who work in great towns and have to deal with large congregations, to make it necessary to paint the portrait over again. We are all familiar with its refinement of manners, and the elaborate apparatus of its luxuries. We all know its great advances in knowledge, especially in the knowledge of the physical world, and of its laws and forces. We are all aware of the restless energy with which investigation is being pushed into every direction, from the earth beneath us to the heavens above, in search of the ultimate principles of things; and many of us are conscious how great an element of weakness there to the excessive specialness of modern science, for the absorption in minute details contracts the mental vision, and destroys width and comprehensiveness of thought. We are all aware, that the wonderful progress in scientific discovery has not been accompanied by any corresponding advance in other directions. In morals we have learned nothing new. In the literature of the Bible, criticism has on one side pushed destruction into wantonness, and has endeavoured to tear the Bible into pieces, with the only result of rendering its structural unity more wonderful and more palpably divine than before. On the other side, it has toiled with reverent care to elucidate the sacred volume, and is now labouring to produce as perfect a reproduction in our world-wide English of the sacred text as possible. In theology the whole doctrinal standards have been sifted and searched and explained; but they have not been substantially changed; and without asserting anything like infallibility for the forms in which scientific theology has embodied the teaching of the Word of God, I do not believe that any substantial change in the distinctive doctrines of the faith ever will be made. The doctrines we Evangelicals hold are identically the same as the doctrines held in Apostolic and primitive days, when the footsteps of the God Incarnate were still fresh on the soil of Palestine, and the air still vibrated with the accents of His voice, who spake as never man spake. The future is not likely to bring deeper spiritual insight than the past. We all are familiar with these circumstances of our day; and we know likewise the confident pride of reason, the ridiculous self-sufficiency, the impatience of all positive dogma, the daring irreverence that does not shrink from the immediate presence of God, characteristic of the age in which we live. The facts are familiar to us, and it is not necessary to dwell upon them; while it is neither the part of wisdom nor of faith to complain of them, as if God were not sufficient for the wants of the nineteenth century, as for the wants of the past. It has seemed to me more important to show that the change and progress characteristic of the seen world only reach to the out-

Digitized by Google

ward conditions of the Christian ministry and no further. How we can best deliver our message and most effectually do our work demands our most earnest attention, and calls for all the freshness of view and teachableness of mind we can possibly give to it. But the work itself,—its relation towards the world unseen, and the message with which we are put in charge,—are as unalterable as God.

Here, then, there is our answer to the outcry of the day. Men complain that the clergy stand still, or lag behind the age, and that they fail to adapt their teaching to the circumstances of the times. They call for a more genial Gospel, suited to the genius and temper of a generation of restless inquiry and unsettled faith. The complaint and the warning deserve every consideration. It is not the part of a wise man to despise advice, come whence it will. It is better to think it all over,—to examine our position from the beginning, and see what truth there is, if any, in the complaints made to us. To my own mind the answer is clear.

(1) As to the substance of our ministry. If men wish us to change this, the simple answer is that we cannot. We can no more change it than we can change God. We can of course vary our preaching by omission or by addition, but the alteration in us will not alter the unseen world of which we are the witnesses. It will simply put our words out of suit with the reality of things, and make them a lie. We should simply be teaching one thing, while we have been charged by God Himself to teach another. We might as well try to create the world over again, and make it after a fashion of our own. The revelation intrusted to us lies in the Scripture, and we have no other. There are the data, the facts with which we have to deal, and we cannot alter them. If it be meant that we do not rightly understand the Scriptures, we are willing to go back over and over again to the foundations of our faith. Show us where we are wrong, and we will correct the error, if error there be; but beyond this we cannot go for the safety of our own souls. "*Have we any power to say anything? The word that God putteth into our mouths, that we will speak.*"

(2) As to the manner in which we discharge our work. We have much to learn, and I hope are willing and anxious to learn it. The alleged sameness of our preaching must be our own fault, for the heights and depths of the Word are infinite, and the aspects and applications of truth as indefinitely varied as are the circumstances of human life, and the experiences of human hearts. The complaint may have reference not to the truth we preach, but to our mode of preaching it, and it may be just. In our relation to the seen world, we need to be men of the day in

Digitized by Google

which God has placed our portion. We need to enter more largely into its sympathies, and share more cordially in its special studies. We need, I believe, a wider and more varied reading, as well as a greater thoughtfulness, to digest what we read; that so, while the grand old walls remain the same, we may the better understand, and the more graphically explain their infinite bearings upon human life and thought, and the unexhausted stores of grace and comfort that lie within their bosom, like jewels waiting to be sought, and precious beyond price, to repay the searching. There is some truth, I believe, in the world's complaint, and it is our duty to correct it. Let us not charge our own idleness or indifference on the truth of God, cramp with our ignorance the depth of His wisdom, or check with our weakness the mighty outgoings of the Spirit of grace and truth.

(3) I venture to add one word more, with the deepest humility and consciousness how much I need my own lesson. By our natural and social life we are linked on to the seen, but by our office to the unseen. The two are not equal, that we should hang like Mahomet's tomb, poised between the two attractions. In any case, the common distinction between secular and sacred, is, I believe, unsound and unscriptural. The distinction supposes human life to be a material woven in many colours, and religion to be but one among the many, occupying its own defined position, as other things occupy their's. I conceive of it very different, and think that the texture of our human life is as it were to be dipped bodily into the colour of our religion, till the blessed hue saturates every thread, and pervades the whole from end to end. The distinction between secular and sacred is always a painful one to me, in any case; but in the case of a minister, it is peculiarly unhappy. He is not to divide his life into two parts, but surrender it all to the Saviour who has called him. Even his seen life should be taken up by the power of the unseen. His very manners and carriage,—his household, his family, his pleasures, his pursuits,—his very self, in his whole vitality,—should reflect God. He should be a living epistle, not all blurred and blotted by his worldliness, but so clearly written in the broad characters of the Spirit of God, as to be known and read of all men. He should be the "*totus teres atque rotundus*" of the Christian citizenship. He is to be in the world, not of the world. Mixing with its duties and sharing its sympathies, he is to fling over them the light of a divine life. On every side lie its temptations. "But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also

Digitized by Google

called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses. I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in His times He shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen."

EDWARD GARBETT.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

"*Is the Church of England worth Preserving?*"[a]

IT is difficult to understand how a true lover of our Church could seriously put such a question as—"Is the Church of England worth preserving?" or if such a question were put to him, his not replying to it by an emphatic monosyllable; instead of occupying twenty-seven pages of closely-printed matter in discussing the answer that should be given to it. A shrewd friend of the writer observed, "What would you think of the delicacy and affection of a husband who should write a pamphlet called, 'Would it be expedient to apply for a divorce from my wife?' and if in that pamphlet the husband deprecated taking any steps in the Divorce Court, and made a great profession of esteem and affection for his wife, surely it would be an indecency entirely without excuse." As Cæsar's wife was necessarily beyond suspicion, so to no true Churchman could, I should have considered, the thought occur "*Whether* his Church was worth preserving?" Had the subject been, How can the Church be best preserved? all friends of the Church would have looked anxiously for words of wisdom and advice from so great an intellect,—though to be sure, the late Premier's practical experience has taught him rather how to destroy a Church than how to preserve it.

But the first thought which naturally occurs on reading Mr. Gladstone's paper is, "What does it mean?" what is its object? It is very difficult to say what it does mean, as it seems to an ordinary mind to mean so many different things; but probably we must take the five propositions with which Mr. Gladstone concludes his paper, as intended to express the general purport of his arguments. The first of these propositions apparently

[a] See Mr. Gladstone's Paper in the *Contemporary Review* for July, 1875.

Digitized by Google

answers the question put by Mr. Gladstone, as it asserts "that the Church of this great nation is worth preserving, and for that end much may well be borne;" but when it is seen *how much* it is proposed that the Church should bear, we find that, according to Mr. Gladstone, it can be preserved only by the sacrifice of its dearest and most cherished principles. Mr. Gladstone says, at p. 210, "But unhappily men of no small account announce that 'they care not for the sign, they must deal with the thing signified;' 'they desire the negation by authority of the doctrine of the real presence of our Lord and Saviour Christ, and of the eucharistic sacrifice;' negations which again are synonymous with the disruption of the English Church." The price then to be paid for the preservation of the Church is the admission of doctrines utterly subversive of her principles, and which, having yielded to, she would no longer be the Church of the Protestant reformed faith.

In the second proposition, Mr. Gladstone deprecates treating Rubrical interpretations of the matters heretofore most sharply contested on the basis of doctrinal significance,—a subject which occupies a large portion of his paper. At p. 210 he says, "Could we but expel this noxious element (doctrinal significance)," etc.; at p. 195, "Doctrinal significance ought not to be attributed to particular acts of external use;" at p. 197, "And strange indeed must, in my view, be the condition of the mind which can deliberately judge that the position at the north end is in itself irreverent, or that facing toward the east is in itself superstitious;" at p. 201, "If we cannot by an effort of self-mastery expel these considerations (namely of doctrinal significance) in our controversies, it is I fear hopeless to expect that the day of doom for the Church of England can be long postponed;" p. 212, "Heavy will be the blame on those who by," etc., etc., "or by needlessly attaching doctrinal significance to the injunction or prohibition of ceremonial acts, shift the balance of doctrinal expression in the Church of England;" p. 213, "And as long as we avoid the rock of doctrinal significance, and maintain the integrity of the Prayer-book." These extracts show how great stress Mr. Gladstone lays on the necessity of not attaching any doctrinal significance to the rites and ceremonies of the Church. But how are the authorities of our Church to abstain from so doing, when an extreme and active section of her community openly and publicly avow that they do attach doctrinal significance to all the disputed points in the Rubrics. The Rev. Mr. Bennett, when examined before the Royal Ritual Commission, said "that he wore the chasuble as involving the doctrine of sacrifice." This one out of numerous quotations which might be given, shows that a doctrinal significance is attached to certain vest-

Digitized by Google

ments. Then as regards the eastward position. In a Ritualist Catechism, the "Ritual Reason Why," it is stated that the priest stands at the west of the table with his back to the people, because that was the position of the Jewish priest who ministered before the Lord at the altar of incense, and because it is the position of a sacrificing priest, etc., etc., so that here again the eastward position is assumed because it has a doctrinal significance, and not for the reason given by Mr. Gladstone at p. 196, "that the eastward position may reasonably be considered as the priest and the people facing the same way when addressing God in prayer." Much more importance is attached to this eastward position by a large section of High Churchmen than to any other point of ritual, and solely as involving doctrine; take away the doctrinal significance, and this position would become valueless in their eyes. Dr. Pusey has said that "the standing before the altar means the primitive doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice, and the bowing after the Sarum use at the consecration means eucharistic adoration." (Speech at St. James' Hall, *Church Review*, June, 1874.) So, too, Mr. Mackonochie in his recent correspondence, although he does not actually represent the chasuble as an essential of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, yet refuses to administer it without this vestment. Can any reasonable person suppose that it has no doctrinal significance in his eyes, and in those of persons symbolizing with him?

Both the use of distinctive vestments and the adoption of the eastward position are closely connected with the doctrine of the "real presence" at the Communion, as held by the Ritualists,—"that it is no bare sign of an absent victim, no mere bread and wine, figuratively signifying the Body and Blood of Christ; but, veiled beneath the form of bread and wine, we offer before God Christ Himself." It is therefore impossible to ignore the fact that special doctrinal significance is, by a certain section of the Church, attached to particular acts of external usage, which Mr. Gladstone says, at p. 195, "ought not to be so attached," and which he says, at p. 201, "unless expelled from our controversies it is hopeless to expect that the day of doom for the Church of England can be long postponed." In what a position are we then placed? If these things remain the Church of England is doomed; and we are told, at p. 200, that the negation by authority of the doctrine of the real presence and of the eucharistic sacrifice would cause the disruption of the Church; and at p. 207, he says, "I look upon any change whatever, if serious in amount and contentious in character, as synonymous with the destruction of the National Church." It would seem then, that turn which way we will, there is no hope for the Church. With respect to Mr. Gladstone's third and fourth propositions,—that

Digitized by Google

it is better to trust to moral force than to penal proceedings, and that if litigation is resorted to, it should be confined to such cases as really imply unfaithfulness to the national religion, there can on the first principle involved scarcely be a difference of opinion. No one can wish for penal proceedings if they can be avoided; but if moral force fails, as it has hitherto failed, to put a stop to practices, declared by the highest authority to be contrary to the doctrines and principles of the Established Church, what then is to be done? The object of the new Bill is not to contract the liberty hitherto enjoyed by the Church, so long as that liberty does not degenerate into license, or where it has not so degenerated. It does not mean to worry the clergy by a strict, rigid, literal obedience to long-disused rubrics on matters of minor importance, but to reserve the powers of the law for proceedings which imperil the purity and integrity of the Church.

An Act or law, or any clause of an Act, may thus be held in abeyance, and not be acted upon because no necessity for its being put in force has arisen, without becoming obsolete or inoperative when circumstances demand its application. Thus an Act of 10 Geo. IV., making the presence in this country of a Jesuit a misdemeanour, although it has never been put in force, has not, according to a recent statement made by Mr. Disraeli in the House of Commons become obsolete, but was a reserved force to be used if necessary; so that, whilst by this Act of 1874, real offenders against the doctrines and principles of the Established Church will subject themselves to its full force, no clergyman need fear being vexatiously or maliciously interfered with so long as he conducts the services of his church with moderation, and in accordance with the rubrics, liturgy, etc., in all important points.

Most careful provision has indeed been made to prevent advantage been taken of this Act on frivolous or capricious grounds, by constituting the Bishops as a species of buffer to break the shock of unnecessary litigation. By the Act the Bishops are endowed with a double capacity: one, that of arbitration, where arbitration is accepted; and the other, and by far the most important one, that of a grand jury in his own person. For as no prisoner can be brought to trial unless a true bill has been found against him (that is, in the case of all serious offences) so no complaint against a clergyman can be adjudicated upon unless by the consent of the Bishop.

This great power has, doubtless, been given to the Bishops to enable them to put a stop to complaints against practices which, although they may involve a breach of the strict letter of some rubric, are far too trifling and unimportant, or unsuited to the

Digitized by Google

present times, to require to be attended to, or omitted; and thus to confine such representations to matters seriously affecting the true interests of the Church.

That this power will have this effect there is every reason to believe, for all the Bishops who have up to this time spoken on the subject have urgently set forth the desirableness of not resorting to the law unless on matters of vital importance, so that there is no fear of the arbitrary enforcement of obsolete rubrics, or of the hard, dry, rigid adherence to the law on minor points, or as described by Mr. Gladstone at p. 212, of an attempt to establish a cast-iron rule of uniform obedience to a vast multitude of provisions sometimes obscure, sometimes obsolete, and very variously understood, being demanded by the Act. Indeed, the only fear seems to be whether too much power has not been vested in the Bishops in this respect; and whether well-founded complaints may not in some instances be suppressed; but as the Bishop, if he refuses to entertain a case, must give his reasons in writing for such refusal, it is expected, and we hope rightly, that the publicity which would be given to the Bishop's proceedings would secure that all cases of real importance, and in regard to which the aggrieved parties have just cause for complaint, would be adjudicated upon.

But whilst a limit is thus placed upon the complaints of the parishioners, a limit must also be placed upon the latitude allowed to the clergy, and upon the innovations introduced of late years into the services of our Church by a section of the clergy as contrary to the principles and doctrines of the Established Church. This has been declared to be needful in many important particulars by the highest authorities in Church and State; the latitude the Church is so willing to accord to all her members having been exceeded. Even Mr. Gladstone seems by some passages in his Paper to admit the necessity of putting a stop to wanton "innovations" or "revolutionary changes." For in p. 206, he says, "When that communion by wanton innovation betrays its duty, and aggravates the controversies of Christendom, the best friend to its eventual unity may repudiate at all hazards, and to all lengths resist the revolutionary change." This passage is perfectly applicable to the Ritualists of the present day, whom Lord Selborne, in the House of Lords, designated "as a revolutionary and aggressive party in the Church." Again at p. 207, Mr. Gladstone says, "I look upon any change whatever, if serious in amount, and contentious in character, as synonymous with the destruction of the National Establishment." Surely, these are terms which apply pointedly to the Ritualistic party.

But Mr. Gladstone says at p. 208, "If there be within the Church of England a section of clergy, or of laity, which is

Digitized by Google

engaged in such a conspiracy which aims at remodelling the Church on the basis of the Papal Church, it is one extremely, almost infinitesimally small;" and again "My point is, that those who aim at Romanizing the Church are, at most, a handful." Even, if this party be such a mere handful as Mr. Gladstone assumes, we know that a little leaven will in time leaven the whole mass, and that a cancer or gangrene, if not eradicated at first, will soon spread, and fill the whole body with disease when it will be too late to attempt its cure.

But, here again, Mr. Gladstone says at p. 212, "But I am far from complaining of those who think that the evils of litigation ought to be encountered rather than permit even a handful of men to introduce into our services evidences of a design to Romanize the religion of the country; and I have always thought that effective provision should be made to check sudden and arbitrary innovations as such, even when it does not present features of intrinsic mischief," and at p. 213, "I am far, however, from asserting that all enforcements of the law, beyond those above described, must of necessity produce acute and fatal mischief."

But a little before, at p. 212, he says, "Surely, prudence would dictate that under these circumstances, all *existing* latitude of law and well-established practice should, as a rule, be respected. That no conscience be pressed by new theological tests, either of word or action, and we should prefer the hope of a peaceful understanding in some even distant future to the certainty of a ruinous discord as the fruit of precipitancy, and violent courses." And at p. 209, "For the avoidance of these dangers my long cherished conviction still subsists, that the best and most effectual remedy is to be found in forbearing to raise contentious issues, or to aim at ruling consciences by courts."

If to demand the negation of the doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (as held and promulgated by the Ritualists), is synonymous with the disruption of the English Church; if all *existing* latitudes of law and well-established practices are to be respected; if we are to wait for a peaceful understanding in some even distant future;—then most assuredly the doom of the Established Church of England cannot long be postponed.

In all Mr. Gladstone's observations it is of course necessary to know *to whom* he attributes the course he so much condemns, of attaching "doctrinal significance" to particular acts of external usage, and whether he repudiates as beneath notice the published opinions of Ritualists, and even of High Churchmen, on this point; also, what he means by "wanton innovations," by "charges serious in amount and contentious in character," by

Digitized by Google

existing latitude of law and well-established practices, "by new theological tests of word or action," and other similar expressions. Because it makes all the difference in the acceptance or non-acceptance of Mr. Gladstone's propositions whether he applies these and similar terms to the Ritualistic party in the Church, or to the proceedings sanctioned by the Public Worship Bill of 1874. And this brings us to the consideration of Mr. Gladstone's fifth proposition,—that "the sentences of our Courts should have uniform regard to the rules and results of full historical investigation, and should, if possible, allow to stand over for the future matters insufficiently cleared, rather than decide them upon partial and fragmentary evidence."

It is on this proposition that we wish chiefly to dwell, because however difficult it may be to answer the question in regard to Mr. Gladstone's paper of "What does it mean?" there will be decidedly less difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to "What is its object?" for whether he thinks it desirable, or for the good of the Church, that the *handful* of men who aim at Romanizing the Church should be put down by law or not, he has devoted a large portion of his paper to demonstrate the utter futility of the Public Worship Bill to effect that object; and the coincidence of the publication of this paper with the very day that the Bill came into operation is, at least, remarkable. Had it been a paper to help all the parties concerned in carrying out the provisions of the Bill,—an expression of opinion,—advice and information from such a quarter, at such a juncture, would have been considered well timed, and have been most thankfully received; but when we find long arguments adduced to show that no public good can be expected from the Bill, its cotemporaneous appearance with the first day of its coming into operation naturally gives rise to other surmises as to its real object.

We will now endeavour to show how utterly hopeless it is, according to Mr. Gladstone, to expect any good to arise from the operation of the Public Worship Regulation Bill. At p. 213, he says, "But I must endeavour before closing these remarks to bring into view further reasons against free and large resort to penal proceedings in regard to ceremonial in the Church." And the reasons he gives are, that the lawfulness of the rules and ceremonies of the Church does not admit of being determined by mere dry, technical, hard law alone, but requires an extensive knowledge of history, archæology, and antiquarianism, to arrive at a just conclusion on their merits.

If this be the case, it was not difficult to show that the Public Worship Regulation Bill must be inoperative. The great object of this Bill, as explained in the eighth clause, is to enable "any

Digitized by Google

three parishioners, etc., to make a representation, or, in other words, to complain of any incumbent who uses, or permits to be used, any unlawful ornament of the minister of the Church, or neglects to use any prescribed ornament or vesture," "or who fails to observe, or cause to be observed, the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer relating to the performance in such Church of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the said book; or has made, or permitted to be made, any unlawful addition to, alteration of, or omission from such services, rites, and ceremonies." But if an extensive knowledge of history, archæology, etc., is necessary to determine what is, or what is not lawful, in how many cases will there be aggrieved parishioners possessing the requisite knowledge?

But supposing, that notwithstanding their ignorance on these subjects, they do make a representation to the Bishop, would he be competent to form a correct opinion on the cases? What does Mr. Gladstone say on this point? Speaking of the probability of the "Judge" appointed by the Act not having made ecclesiastical law his special study, he says (pp. 213, 214):—

"It may be thought, with some reason, that the Episcopal Assessors will, in doctrinal cases, help to supply the defect; but it would not be easy to arrange that the most learned Bishops should be chosen as assessors: and the general standard of learning on the Bench cannot, under the hard conditions of modern times, be kept very high. The number of individuals must at all times be small who unite anything like deep or varied learning with the administrative and pastoral qualities, and the great powers of business and active work which are more than ever necessary in a Bishop. But in questions of ceremonial the difficulties are greater still."

And again, at p. 211, "Why should we expect of the Bishop, because he may be assumed to have a fair store of theology, or of the Judge..... that they should be adepts in historical research," etc., etc.

And again, at p. 215, 216: "Now this is a proposition purely antiquarian; it depends upon a precise knowledge of what is sometimes termed ecclesiastical millinery. Can Judges or even Bishops be expected to possess this very special kind of knowledge, or be held blameable for not possessing it?"

According to this, the Bishop is not much more fit to form a judgment in a case of ceremonial than the parishioner. But supposing, again, that the Bishop, despite his unfitness for the task, does send the case on to the Judge, is there a better chance of his being capable of deciding on its merits?

Hear what Mr. Gladstone says regarding the Judge. Having noticed that the consolidation of some of our Law Courts, etc., have materially impaired the chances of finding in our Judges of

Digitized by Google

ecclesiastical causes the form of fitness growing out of special study, he says (p. 214): "It is, I believe, customary, and perhaps wise, that a prior judgment of the highest Court of Appeal should govern a later one. . . ." Now however well this may stand with respect to interpretation of law, yet with respect to historical and antiquarian researches, and to judgments which turn on them, it would evidently be untenable and even ludicrous." And then comes the question, "What right have we to expect from our Judges, amidst the hurry and pressure of their days, and often at a time of life when energy must begin to flag, either the mental habits, or the acquisitions of the archæologist, the critic, or above all of the historian?" And again, "What is the condition of a Judge who has to interpret the law by means of *data* which only the historian and the antiquarian can supply, and digest respectively, when they have not digested or supplied them?" And again, "Yet a Judge may not only have to digest his own legal apparatus, but may also be required to dive at a moment's notice into the *tohu-bohu* of inquiries which have never yet emerged from the stage of chaos, and the decision of matters of great faith and moment for Christian worship, and the peace of the Church, comes to depend upon what is at best, by no fault of his, random and fragmentary knowledge."

After stating that many of the cases brought before an Ecclesiastical Judge will depend more upon a knowledge of literature than of law, and that the word "evidence" is sometimes used in judgments on ceremonials in a mode which involves "a dangerous fallacy, as it seems to be used in a judicial sense, whereas it is in reality used in a literary sense," he then proceeds: "If I am right in laying down as the grand requisite for arriving at truth in these cases, the historian's attainments and frame of mind, the Judge and the lawyer labour in these cases under some peculiar difficulties."

It appears from the foregoing extracts, and others might have been given, that there is but little hope of a Judge being found to carry out the Public Worship Act endowed, not only with the necessary high legal knowledge, but with all the attainments of the historian, the archæologist, and the antiquary, without which, according to Mr. Gladstone, he will not be qualified to come to a decision on points of ritual, of ceremony, or of doctrine. Our only hope then is to depend upon literary judgments. But will they help us much? Mr. Gladstone having disposed of the Bishops and the Judges, thus speaks of the historian (p. 218):

"It is almost a necessity for the Judges as it is absolutely for the advocate that every cause be resolved categorically by an 'Aye,' or by a 'No.' But the historical inquirer is not conversant with 'Aye,'

Digitized by Google

or 'No' alone: he is familiar with a thousand shades of colour and of light between them,—the very first requisite of the historic mind is suspense of judgment. Judicial business requires, as a rule, decision between two: it is the judgment of Solomon; but the historian may have to mince the subjects into many fragments, according to the probabilities of the case. He deals habitually with conjectures and likelihoods, as well as with positive assertions; and the 'I doubt,' which was so much criticized in Lord Eldon, is among the most prominent characteristics of the philosopher and truth-loving historian."

If these are the characteristics of a historian, what hope would there be of a nice point of ceremonial law ever being decided "Aye" or "No" by him? and would the "I doubt" ever satisfy either party? or the "conjectures," the "likelihoods," the "probabilities," and that first requisite of the historian,—"suspense of judgment,"—help the aggrieved parishioners, or bring peace into a parish?

Surely then only one conclusion can be drawn from Mr. Gladstone's arguments. With an aggrieved parishioner who is scarcely likely to have the necessary requirements to know whether what he complains of is really right or wrong; with Bishops and Judges, who either from possessing only partial and fragmentary knowledge of the subjects brought before them, from want of time, or from not having made these branches of philosophy their special study, have not the peculiar acquirements necessary for adjudicating on such matters; with the historian, who would bring to bear on all cases the oracular expression, "I doubt," and the satisfactory result of "suspense of judgment;"—with such an accumulation of inefficiency, what possible good can be expected from the working of the Public Worship Regulation Bill?

It will be remembered that Mr. Gladstone made great objections to this Bill when it was introduced into Parliament last summer. He cannot be said to have formally opposed it, because the second reading in the House of Commons was agreed to without a division; but the six celebrated resolutions which he brought forward, and which he said he was prepared to sift to the bottom one after another, regardless of time, though this threat was not carried out, sufficiently shows the spirit of his opposition to the Bill. And the *Times*, in a leader of the 10th July, 1874, thus concludes its remarks on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions:—

"Mr. Gladstone has thus challenged the House of Commons to declare whether it thinks it advisable that 'universal nonconformity,' as Sir William Harcourt expressed it, should be proclaimed, and that free license should be given to Romanizing innovations,

Digitized by Google

until we have found a Court which can judge of the motives of clergymen? Is it necessary to point out what would be the inevitable consequence of accepting such advice? It would be said everywhere that Parliament had been solemnly asked to proclaim that the law should be obeyed, but that the former Prime Minister had declared that if people liked certain usages, it was no matter whether they were legal or not, and that consequently everyone was free to follow his own opinion. What, after Mr. Gladstone's speech, is to be the answer to such an excuse if this Bill should be rejected? Mr. Gladstone is said to have pointed to a second Disestablishment in his speech on the Scotch Patronage Bill. If his advice be taken on the present Bill he will have set up a state of confusion and disorder in the Church of England which can hardly fail to render its maintainance as a National Church impossible."

Are not these remarks equally applicable to Mr. Gladstone's present Paper, as to his speech and six resolutions of July 9th, 1874? If everyone is to do as he likes because there is no Court yet known capable of pronouncing a correct judgment on their proceedings, it is not difficult to see that in the present temper of an extreme party in the Church its maintenance as a National Church would soon become impossible. And although the arguments are drawn out to greater length in the Paper under notice, than they were in his speech of July 9th, do they not both tend to the same views? In that speech Mr. Gladstone, after referring to Mr. Russell Gurney's having said that he was not willing to contract the limits of existing liberty, "but that all unlawful omissions and commissions he wished to have put down,"—proceeded,—"I want to know whether the House is prepared to adopt the principle, that in the Services of the Church of England all unlawful omissions and commissions shall be deliberately and advisedly put down? I do not scruple to say that they ought not to be put down, and I am not to be frightened by anything which may be said to me about Ritualism, which after all is but the smallest part of the question with which we have to deal." It may be stated in passing, that Mr. Gurney's real words were, "Parties must within certain limits continue to exist. He was not disposed to contract these limits, but on the contrary he would gladly widen the basis upon which the Church was established." This seems something very different from not contracting the limits of *existing* liberty, as interpreted by the Ritualists, because the very acts which it is the object of the Bill to suppress are carried on under the pretence of the *existing* liberty allowed by the law.

But to return to Mr. Gladstone's Paper and to his speech and resolutions of the 9th July last, they both appear to have the same object,—that of showing the worthlessness of the Public

Digitized by Google

Worship Regulation Bill. And that this Paper should appear twelve months afterwards, on the very day on which this Bill came into operation, does it not seem unmistakably to denote the *object* with which it was written and published at that particular time?

One point however still remains to be considered. Is Mr. Gladstone right in assuming that all questions of rite and ceremony and of doctrine must be decided, not by hard, dry law alone,—that is by the Rubrics, etc.,—but by the independent evidence of history, archæology, and antiquity? If he is not right on this point, then all his arguments fail to affect the question.

Our Prayer-book with its Rubrics was sanctioned by Act of Parliament in 1662, and with the Articles and Canons became the Law of the Realm on all Ecclesiastical matters. Every Act of Parliament consists of a certain number of clauses, which contain in as precise language as can be composed the exact meaning of the Act in all its details, and any judgment passed in accordance with the Act is founded on the literal and precise meaning of the clause or clauses to which the particular judgment refers, and on that alone. The Rubrics in our Prayer-book are similar to such clauses of an Act: they ordain and explain certain rites and ceremonies, and the manner in which they are to be performed, and are therefore in reference to the Prayer-book,—the clauses of the Act, so to speak, by which the ecclesiastical Judge will be guided in his interpretation of the law of the Church. And who so fit to decide on the true meaning of a clause or Rubric, as a Judge accustomed to weigh carefully every word and expression, to sift evidence, and to attach their due import to every phrase and sentence, who has made it his special study to analyze and detect the real purport of written law, and who has trained his mind to give a decisive "Aye" or "No" on all matters brought before him?

By the eighth clause of the Public Worship Bill a complaint can be lodged against an Incumbent for not observing "the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer, relating to the performances of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered in the said Book." And all clergymen at their Ordination promise that they will use the forms prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and none other: "and that they will minister the doctrines, and sacraments, and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same;" and which are contained in the rubrics, articles, and canons. It is then by the Prayer Book, the articles, and canons, and by them alone, always excepting the Bible, that both clergy and laity are to be guided. It is to the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer, on the strength of

Digitized by Google

which complaints will be made, and not to a whole library of history, archæology, and antiquity, to which we are referred, and by the literal, grammatical, and common sense meaning of those directions that the Judge, unalarmed by the high estimate of his historical, antiquarian, and archæological attainments suggested by Mr. Gladstone, will be guided in coming to a decision on a case.

There ought not to be much difficulty in interpreting the rubrics, etc., when stripped of all this extraneous matter with which it is endeavoured to envelope them: and we do not think that there will be. The law, in all disputed points, will thus soon become known, and when known, will be obeyed.

The time for this reference to history, archæology, and antiquity, has gone by, so far as regards our present liturgy, as this was done by the compilers of our present Prayer-book. The result of their researches, deliberations, and conclusions is embodied in the rubrics, and the articles, which having been sanctioned by Act of Parliament became, and still continue to be, the law of the realm: and, whether they be right or wrong, they must continue to be the exponents of ecclesiastical law until they are altered or repealed. Of course, if all, or any of these rubrics are found, or thought, to be unsuited to the advanced state of opinion on these matters, or to the habits and altered circumstances of the times, or if subsequent researches should, in the opinion of those competent to judge, show that they do not illustrate the true principles of the reformed Protestant Church, under such circumstances the same law that gives them legal authority can withdraw or modify them, in a constitutional manner, but until this is done,—and we sincerely hope, for the good and peace of the Church, that it will not be done,—we must abide by the rubrics, etc., as they are, and by the interpretation that the best judicial minds put upon their literal and grammatical meaning. We should thus at all events know the ground on which we stand, and not be tossed about on the waves of conjecture, probability, likelihood, and suspense of judgment, on which we should be cast by substituting the doubt of the historian, and the fanciful speculations of the archæologist and the antiquarian, for the plain and precise diction of our Book of Common Prayer, acts, rubrics, etc.

We have not attempted to discuss the arguments by which Mr. Gladstone supports the first four of the propositions with which he concludes his Paper, our object being to show that *if* his conclusions are correct,—if to demand the negation of the doctrine of the real Presence of our Lord and Saviour Christ (as explained and demanded by the Ritualists) and of Eucharistic sacrifices, is synonymous with the disruption of the Church; if considerations of doctrinal significance cannot be expelled from

Digitized by Google

our controversies, it is hopeless to expect that the day of doom for the Church of England can be long postponed. That if changes, however serious in amount and contentious in character, can be introduced with impunity by the whims of individuals; if all *existing* latitude of law and well-established practices, which Mr. Gladstone says should be respected, is intended to apply to the *existing* latitude claimed by an extreme section of the Church at the present day; if when he says, "that no consciences should be pressed by new theological tests," he means that the tests of the literal and grammatical sense of our Liturgy and Prayer-book are not to be applied to the doctrines and practices of the Ritualists;—if Mr. Gladstone's conclusions are correct on all these points, then it does appear to be almost a mockery to say "that the Church of this great State is worth preserving," for it would be shown that it can only be preserved by the renunciation of the most important doctrines and principles of the Established Church of England, as embodied and explained in our Book of Common Prayer, etc., and of the Ecclesiastical Laws of the Realm which are, thank God, still in force.

With respect to the fifth proposition, we have endeavoured to show that if we accept the arguments in support of it we must admit the utter worthlessness of the Public Worship Regulation Bill of 1874, but we have in this case presumed to demur to the assumption, that an extensive knowledge of history, archæology, and of antiquarian lore is absolutely necessary to enable a Bishop to decide whether sufficient grounds have been shown for bringing a complaint before the Judges so as to enable the Judge to decide on the merits of the case when it is brought before him. The theological knowledge and usual literary attainments of our Bishops, and the high legal acquirements, and great mental capacity, and unimpeachable integrity of our Judges are quite sufficient to secure a correct and impartial interpretation of Ecclesiastical Law as contained in our Book of Common Prayer, in the Articles, and Canons of the Church. Past experience has amply shown that however much the law may be eluded and disregarded, when allowed to fall into disuse, or feebly administered, yet when a real determination is shown to enforce its just demands with firmness, justice, and moderation, cavilling and disregard are soon changed to submission and obedience.

Even Mr. Gladstone admits the law may be enforced to a certain extent without fatal consequences, for he says, at p. 213,—

"I am far, however, from asserting that all enforcements of the law beyond what I have above described, must of necessity produce

Digitized by Google

acute and fatal mischief. Much folly, both of reges and Achivi, has been borne, and may yet be borne, while judgments are such as to carry on their front the note of impartiality, and as long as we avoid the rock of doctrinal significance, and maintain the dignity of the Prayer-book."

It is quite clear that the "folly" here alluded to, which has been borne, and may yet be borne without fatal mischief, cannot refer to certain points which he previously stated are synonymous with the disruption of the English Church, but which our Church, if it is to remain the Established Church of England, must insist upon; and which, if rightly and firmly insisted upon, so far from proving synonymous with the disruption of the Church, will be found to be the surest, and indeed the only sure means of preserving its integrity, its purity, and its union with all with whom union is desirable, or possible.

As Churchmen we feel almost ashamed at treating seriously the discussion of such a question, as "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" and had it come from any ordinary quarter, it would have been put on one side as a subject beyond the pale of consideration by any lover of his Church. But coming as it does from one of the greatest statesmen and most acute intellects of the day, it has a political as well as a religious bearing which cannot be overlooked; and it therefore behoves every one who looks upon our Church as a true exponent of the Protestant reformed faith, and its connection with the State as synonymous with the prosperity and greatness of his country, to lend his aid, however feeble, to controvert doctrines and suggestions, which, if adopted, would inevitably lead to its destruction as the National Church of this realm.

EAST INDIA (FAMINE).

Copy of Letter to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, forwarding extra Supplement to the "Gazette of India," dated 26th February, 1875, *containing the final Reports of the Measures taken in consequence of the Scarcity of* 1873—74. *Presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's command. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 23rd March,* 1875.

"PEACE hath her victories no less renowned than war," is one of Milton's noblest passages, but we fear not one of the truest, unless we take the word renowned as signifying that which is worthy of renown, rather than that to which the world assigns its due meed of praise. The paper which we have placed at the

Digitized by Google

head of this article contains the record of a victory of peace as bravely won as any that history has yet recorded,—won in a campaign of no ordinary difficulty, in which the lives of millions hung in suspense, and one error of judgment might have been fatal; and yet we believe that it will attract less attention than the record of the smallest of the campaigns in which British troops have faced the realities of war. If this is the case, it will be partly due to the completeness of the victory itself. Some partial misfortune often enables, and leads, us to estimate the disaster of a general defeat; but when the enemy is driven back on all sides,—when consummate generalship has foreseen every mode of attack, has guarded every weak point, and allowed the enemy to force no single outpost nor gain one single advantage, —when the enemy, thus met at every point, has retired from the field, the world is often ungrateful enough to attribute the result rather to the insignificance of the foe than to the genius and skill of the General.

But we do not hesitate to say that the book is not only worthy of careful study, but will amply repay it. It is not often that we have occasion to recommend a Parliamentary Blue Book, not only as useful but as pleasant reading; but we can so recommend this to any one who is desirous of obtaining a vivid idea of the vastness of our Indian Empire, of the responsibilities it involves, and of the manner in which our fellow-countrymen are discharging those responsibilities. In an article in our May number, on the travels of Baron Hubner, we mentioned that that statesman proposed to devote a year to travel in India, in order "there to study the effects produced in the course of a century by the contact of a great Christian nation with the millions of Hindoos and Mussulmans submitted to their sway." To those who have not the Baron's means and opportunities, we believe that the knowledge, which he proposes to seek on the spot, could not be presented in a more concise and striking form than in the pages of this official record,—in which the Governor-General of India submits to the Secretary of State, and through him to the nation, a narrative of the manner in which he and those under his command discharged the duty intrusted to them at a time when not only the efficiency of our administration, but the Christian character of our rule also, were fairly put upon their trial. How nobly they bore the test we, as Englishmen, should be proud to know and forward to acknowledge.

When it first became known in England, in 1873, that one of the most thickly-peopled provinces of our Indian Empire was threatened with famine, the heart of the nation was deeply stirred. There is something peculiar in the manner in which the Government of India is regarded by the people of England which is

Digitized by Google

far from doing us discredit as a nation. Whether it be that we feel that something in our acquisition of the country and the earlier history of our rule has left India our creditor, or whether it be that the separation of India from party politics allows our judgment fair play, or whether the fact that our rule of that country is something as yet unique in the world's history; from whatever cause it arises, there is certainly a feeling that our honour, as a nation in the sight of the world is deeply involved in our successful government of India. We feel, and feel justly, that unless we can show that a sway which we forced upon that country, and which we have lately heroically maintained against a rebellious army if not a reluctant people, is a blessing to those we rule, we stand self-condemned. When, therefore, the news reached us that a terrible calamity threatened our oldest possessions there, the nation declared with one voice that it held our representative responsible that it should be averted if human means could do it.

A recent calamity was still fresh in memory. Famine had fallen upon the province of Orissa, and there a rigid adherence to the general principles of political economy, where the circumstances were altogether exceptional, had led to disaster, and sacrificed the lives of many of our subjects; and we were bound to profit by the experience thus dearly purchased, and apply its teachings to mitigate, or if possible to avert, the still more fearful calamity which was imminent. A terrible responsibility thus devolved upon the ruler of India and his colleagues, and the action of that Government was watched with intense interest until the danger was past, and our fellow-subjects saved. There were few in England who did not follow the narratives of some one of the able correspondents of our leading papers, and from time to time perhaps pass some severe criticisms on the action of the rulers of the country, founding their opinions on observations extending over only a narrow sphere; and now that the whole subject is condensed, as it is in the book before us, into the narrow compass of a few pages, and presented in a readable, and almost an attractive form, it is a mere matter of justice that the official statement, showing what the danger was, and how it was averted, should not pass unnoticed.

Our object in the present article is to show to our readers that there is within the reach of all a record well deserving their attention, of the deeds of their fellow-countrymen, which, while it has the authenticity of a public despatch, has all the interest of a personal narrative. When a subject of this extent and complication has been already condensed into so small a compass, further compression is impossible; but we hope to select a few facts, and so to place them before our readers that they shall be

Digitized by Google

tempted themselves to refer to a document replete with valuable information and useful teaching.[a]

It is remarkable that almost the precise period spoken of by Baron Hübner had elapsed between the time when Bengal suffered from one of the most fearful famines recorded in the history of a country peculiarly liable to that terrible scourge, and the year in which the dreaded enemy again appeared; and we believe that the effects of the intervening century of Christian rule could not be more vividly portrayed than by contrasting the state of the country in 1770, when more than one third of the population of Bengal, estimated by Warren Hastings at 10,000,000, is computed to have perished, with its condition in 1873, when Lord Northbrook was called upon to bring all the resources at his command, and all the appliances of modern science, to meet and repel the attack. We can but glance at some of the leading features in this contrast.

In 1770, only thirteen years had elapsed since the battle of Plassey had laid the foundation of our Empire. British rule extended over only a few sea-board provinces, and it would be hard to prove that these enjoyed any great advantages, in regard to trade and agriculture, over the rest of India. The Mogul sway was fast dissolving before the growing power of the Mahrattas, and hundreds of petty States were profiting by the weakness of the paramount power to assume independence, and were guarding their frontiers with jealous care. Roads, properly so called, there were none. The tracks which trade followed were exposed to the exactions of every petty ruler, and to the depredations of armed plunderers. The natural arteries of the country—its noble rivers—were equally impeded; and, indeed, long after this date, and after the country was reduced to order, so imperfect were the means of inland transport, that the superfluous produce of one province could afford no mitigation to the sufferings of scarcity, or the horrors of famine, in another. If this was the state of the internal trade of the country, that of its external commerce was scarcely better. The sea all round the Indian shores was infested by pirates, and even if the remote lands of Burmah or the Punjab had had any superfluous produce to supply the needs of Bengal (which they certainly had not), neither the means of transport nor the power of access were available. When the rain of heaven was withheld, and the scanty hoards of the peasantry were exhausted, no resource was open to the famine-stricken population, but to fold their hands and die with the patient endurance of Hindoos. It would be easy to gather from the pages of history,—aye, and from the

[a] The price of the Parliamentary Paper is 1s. 1d.

Digitized by Google

recollections of men now living,—harrowing pictures of what an Indian famine was; but it is pleasanter to dwell upon the change of which it has pleased an all-wise Providence to make our nation the instrument. To appreciate this change, it is only necessary to turn to the contemplation of the position of the Governor-General of India, when called upon in 1873 to bring all the resources of the Empire to repel the threatened danger from the same territory that had been so terribly devastated in 1770. How these resources were used, we shall see hereafter; what they were, we may pause for a moment to consider.

A territory extending from Peshawur to Mergui, teeming with an industrious agricultural population, was in the enjoyment of profound peace. Trade, freed from every internal impost, was bearing the produce of the fields to the great line of inland navigation, or to the great highway of nations,—the ocean. There was not a province which was not yielding some superfluous produce to swell the external commerce of the country, and raise its exports to the sixty millions which it has now reached. But not only was the internal trade freed from impost or plunder; a wise legislation had some years before freed the port-to-port trade of the country from all duty; and the British fleet had long protected the ocean commerce from all danger. While these had been the effects of administrative measures, modern science had added resources unknown to former generations. Flotillas of steam-tugs and vessels navigated the larger rivers, and a noble fleet of steam-ships connected the remote provinces of the empire with the capital and with each other. A line of railway already connected the capital with its remotest frontier at Peshawur, and was throwing out arms in all directions to reach the outlying provinces on each side. The telegraph placed the central Government in instantaneous communication with its agents throughout the Empire, and the executive, sensitive to every vibration, could thus, in the language of Pope,

> "Feel at each thread and live along the line."

Add to these the resources of a well-plenished treasury and unlimited public credit, and we may form some idea of the change which a century of British rule had wrought in India.

But with all these resources the task before the Governor-General was one of terrible magnitude. It was the first time, we believe, in the history of the world, that a Government had declared itself responsible for the life of every one of its subjects, even down to the poorest peasant; and it became one of the first duties of the executive to form an estimate of the extent of the task which it had thus undertaken.

It is not a little remarkable, and it had an important bearing

Digitized by Google

on the after history of the famine, that the Government of Bengal was at this time held by Sir George Campbell, an officer of ripe experience, who, in addition to other high offices, had been employed as one of the Commissioners to investigate and report upon the Orissa famine and the causes of its disastrous effects. It was natural therefore that he should be peculiarly observant of any symptom of a similar danger, and alive to the measures of precaution and preparation which the emergency called for. To the timely warnings and wise measures of Sir G. Campbell much of the success of the Government of India in dealing with the famine is to be attributed, and among these the acquisition of reliable information, as to the extent of the threatened evil and consequently the measure of the required preparations, was the most important.

When the failure of the early rains announced the probability of a calamity, measures for gauging its extent were adopted; while hopes and fears alternated, as anticipations of later showers were entertained and disappointed, these were continued; and when the imminence of famine became a fact, its area and intensity were estimated with a close approach to accuracy, and the Government had to brace itself for the task before it.

This was appalling enough. It was calculated that the area affected by death or famine would exceed 40,000 square miles, containing a population of nearly 18,000,000; and that of these nearly 4,000,000 would be wholly or partially dependent on Government aid. It was reckoned that if the helpless population was to be saved, the number of villages to be inspected or visited would exceed 27,000, and the houses amount to upwards of two millions (2,096,843). The grain lost by the failure of the rains was estimated at from three to three-and-a-half millions of tons.

By what means can we realize the import of figures such as these? Perhaps if we think what would be the task of visiting the 96,843 houses, which form the fractional part of the above sum; and when we have realized in some degree the magnitude of the undertaking, consider that this multiplied twenty times falls still short of the whole by 159,983 houses, we get some idea of the vastness of the work. Or if we consider what is the task of supplying a force of 10,000 men marching into a country destitute of supplies, as in the Abyssinian or Ashantee wars, and then multiply this by 400, to bring the sum up to the 4,000,000 of the dearth-stricken land, we form some idea of the amount of human life dependent on the action of the government.

But we have another standard by which to measure the task which devolved on the officers of Government. After making

Digitized by Google

every allowance for the stores of food remaining from former seasons, and for the action of private trade, it was calculated that the Governor-General must supply, and convey to the scene of distress, no less than 404,000 tons of rice, in order that a subsistence at the rate of 1½ lbs. per day might be ensured to the people: and in order to provide a reserve at Calcutta against unforeseen emergencies, it was resolved that 480,000 tons must be provided.

Now let us pause for a moment, and in order that we may form some estimate of the blessings which European civilization has conferred upon India, let us consider how entirely hopeless must have been the task without the appliances which these afford. We need not go back to the records of 1770; the memory of those still living recalls the time when the river "budgero," and the country cart drawn by a pair of bullocks, would have been the only means of transport between the source of supply and the scene of want. How perfectly inadequate these would have been to the emergency is obvious. Even if the river craft, working against the rapid streams of the heat-shrunken rivers, could have conveyed the grain to the head of the navigation, the task of distribution would still have been hopeless. Although the famine tracts were unusually favoured in regard to inland navigation, still distances varying from 20 to 150 miles must be traversed to reach the starving villages. To such a task the country cart is wholly inadequate. Carrying but half a ton, and moving at the rate of ten or twelve miles a day, even under favourable circumstances but little could be done; but generally in time of famine fodder, and often water, fail. The man and bullocks must be fed on the supplies they carry, and at the end of a journey of any length little of the food is left to aid a population augmented by the man and two cattle who have brought the supply.

When we come presently to mention what the steamer and the railway achieved, the impossibility of its accomplishment without their aid will be still more evident. But let us now consider whence the supply of food was to be obtained, and we shall find that the very fact that such a supply existed is one of the most interesting points in a history replete with striking lessons.

When the extent of need was ascertained, it was obvious that it could be met by the action of Government alone. After every thing had been done to encourage private trade, private enterprise, and private benevolence, it was clear that all these were inadequate to the task. A too strict adherence to the ordinary laws of political economy had, as we have said, led to disaster in Orissa, and the error must not be repeated; but still to rush into

Digitized by Google

the opposite extreme would be equally fatal. The problem was, to ensure the necessary supply with the least possible interference with the natural trade of the country; in fact, so to contrive that the action of Government should be auxiliary and not antagonistic to the private merchant. This would be solved by the Government deriving supplies beyond the limits of the ordinary trade, and making them available to the private trader as soon as they came within the sphere of his action.

But where to find a country so situated, remote, yet accessible, and at the same time producing grain so far beyond the wants of its own population that the surplus should be purchasable at any reasonable rate, to supply the losses of a famine in one of our most populous provinces? Such a country was found within the limits of our own territory, and among the most recent of our possessions. A province which had come under our sway little better than one vast unpeopled swamp, but with a power of production almost beyond parallel, had under our rule been converted into a land of Egyptian fertility, and was now to nourish some of our oldest possessions. The province of Burmah was the direction to which the Governor-General turned in the hour of his need; and he there found not only the supplies which he required, but merchants possessed of the energy and the means requisite to enable them to undertake to transport them, and faithfully to fulfil their undertaking. It is a remarkable illustration of the extent of our Indian Empire, that the commerce of one of its outlying provinces was so great as to yield a supply of this magnitude; and so distinct from the trade of the capital, that purchases even on this scale left the central market undisturbed.

From the province of Burmah, under the judicious management of its Chief Commissioner, the Hon. Ashley Eden, by the aid of two English firms, 289,534 tons of rice, of the value of £2,000,000 sterling, were purchased, husked, packed in bags, and transported to Calcutta, in punctual fulfilment of contracts undertaken for that purpose.

It is equally remarkable that a still more recent possession was the source whence the greatest portion of the supplies furnished by private trade were drawn. The Punjab, converted under our rule into a flourishing territory, was able to pour a large surplus of its food into the market, which by public agency and private trade reached the famine districts. The Madras Presidency was drawn upon to a considerable extent; and from these sources, all within the limits of the Empire, the required supply was made available.

That the operations of Government and those of the private merchant were carried on concurrently is a remarkable proof of the wisdom with which the arrangements of the Government

Digitized by Google

were made. It appeared at the close of the operations that in the course of the year 1874, the quantity of grain imported into the distressed districts by the Government amounted to 460,000 tons, while that ascertained or estimated to have been contributed by private trade amounted to 529,000 tons; thus making a total of about 1,000,000 of tons: "a quantity sufficient to support about 8,000,000 of persons for six months." It is added that "it is a sign of the great resources of the provinces of India, that notwithstanding the drain on Northern India and Burmah, the price of food in those countries was about as cheap as in ordinary years."

We have thus far alluded to the supply of food, its sources, and its transport to the borders of the distressed area; but this touches only a portion, and the easier portion of the task. To ensure its distribution among the distressed villages, and even to reach the helpless and hopeless among a people appalled by a terrible calamity, and to do this without utterly disorganizing society, was the more complicated and more arduous task. This duty necessarily devolved on the Executive Government of Bengal. The Supreme Government could only lay down general rules, and trust with generous confidence to the zeal and ability of its officers to give them effect.

Before giving a few facts from the record before us, to illustrate the magnitude of this task, we select a few to prove how the appliances of modern civilization came in aid of the operations of importation and distribution.

The Telegraph already existed along the principal line of commerce, and placed Government in connection with the chief sources of supply, and with the executive of Bengal.

But "among the essential preliminaries of the administration on the scene of action, was the placing of all the relief centres in telegraphic communication with the existing lines of electric telegraph. Before the famine there was not any telegraphic communication in North Behar, and only one line in North Bengal; but they were rapidly constructed, and communication was established with the remote centres of the worst tracts of country with a speed and efficiency most creditable, it is stated, to the telegraph department. 'The lines,' the report adds, 'despite floods and storms, were kept up through the rainy season.' The numerous and important messages delivered through the relief operations were rendered with remarkable accuracy. The value of this communication, as a resource in these emergent affairs, is too obvious to need any description." (16.)

Three hundred and thirty-six miles of temporary lines were laid down on the emergency.

The steam-vessel, including the steam-tug, was of course one

Digitized by Google

of the principal agencies by which the task undertaken was rendered a possibility. Of the value of its aid the following facts may give some idea. In speaking of the supply of rice from Burmah, the Governor-General, addressing the Chief Commissioners, after the close of the operations, writes:—

"One of the greatest difficulties was, as you observe, to procure tonnage for the grain thus directed from the usual channel of trade, as there was but a short time available to invite freight from distant ports, and as the whole order had to be executed within a few months. In this difficulty you were aided by the British-India Steam Navigation Company, whose fleet was placed at your disposal on very reasonable terms, and was utilized to the extent of 165,789 tons. The balance of the required tonnage was obtained chiefly in large and fast steamers, secured from various parts of the world; and thus the whole order, equal to about two-fifths of the whole exportable produce of the province, was dispatched and delivered in Calcutta, according to dates previously advertised, regularly, punctually, and without any misadventure."

But it was not the ocean steamer alone that was required. When the grain reached Calcutta, the task of conveyance to the interior still remained, and for this purpose not only the existing river craft had to be utilized, but fresh means had to be extemporised. Small light steamers (of 3½ feet draught), four in number, with barges, were manufactured in the dock-yards of Calcutta. Ten such steamers were sent out from England. Four more small steamers with five barges were obtained in Bengal and Madras, and with the auxiliary river craft, and canoes extemporised by the Forest department, a flotilla was formed, consisting of 18 steamers, 22 barges, 4,000 river boats, and 800 canoes.

Nor was this the only form in which the steam-boat was applied. In the interior of the country much of the grain which the contiguous districts could supply had to cross the Ganges,

"This obstacle was overcome by the establishment of steam ferries at the requisite points along the river. For this purpose all the steamers of the Bengal marine were employed, and many vessels of the India-General Steam Navigation were chartered. Depôts, with yards and enclosures, covering many acres, were formed on the river's banks."

But even these appliances would have fallen short of the emergency but for the aid of *the Railway*. It was at this moment that the wisdom of Lord Dalhousie, in planning the great railway system of India, became conspicuous. Not to overload our pages with figures, suffice it to say that the gross increase in the earnings of the railway from the carriage of grain in the eleven months of the famine operations, over the ordinary

Digitized by Google

traffic, was £1,172,194. But the established railways failed to reach the point of suffering, and a temporary line from the Ganges to Durbhunga, the capital of the most distressed district, a distance of fifty-three miles, was constructed, and "carried on with such rapidity, that it was commenced on the 23rd February and opened for the transport of grain on the 17th April, having proceeded at the rate of a mile a day."

To the telegraph, the steamer, and the railway, we might add many other resources of modern engineering, and especially those applicable to irrigation. It is true that in India many noble works have come down to us from remote antiquity which evince great hydraulic skill, but modern science is every year adding to the number; and the scale on which they are being carried on, and their value in the emergency of 1874, are illustrated by the fact that some works which are in progress to utilize the waters of the river Soane, though still in an unfinished state, were brought to bear upon 159,000 acres of land. The amount of food thus secured to the country, was reckoned by the irrigation department to have been 70,000 tons, valued at £580,000 sterling.

These few facts will suffice to show how greatly the suffering people of India were indebted to the civilization of Europe. We must now content ourselves with a general statement of the principles of action sketched out by the Governor-General, and then collect a few passages from the report before us, illustrative of the extent of the operations involved, and the degree of success with which they were carried out.

We have said above that one of the great problems which the Government was called upon to solve was, how to carry on the importation of grain without driving the private trader out of the market. A second was how to relieve the needy, without disorganizing the labour market, and demoralizing the people.

The principles of action resolved on were as follows: that in circumstances where numbers might be exposed to danger of starvation, or to disease from want of food, the Government and its officers should do their utmost to apply the most effectual remedy that might be practicable; that interference with the trade in grain should be avoided so far and as long as such avoidance might be possible; that private trade should be stimulated by lowering the railway rates, the Government paying the difference; that a series of public works of utility should be organized for the employment of the population; and that advances should be made from the public treasury to corporations and individual land-holders willing to undertake works of improvement. Depôts of grain were formed in various places. A central Committee of Relief was formed, and the country was

Digitized by Google

divided into circles, each with a subordinate Committee of Relief. All the departments of Government,—the Civil Service, the Army, the Departments of Public Works, of Woods and Forests, the Commissariat, the Medical Service, besides the Telegraph and Railway,—were all called upon to supply officers, men, and appliances, to the utmost of their power, and even beyond their power, to aid in this great imperial work of humanity.

The description of the circles perhaps gives the most distinct idea, in a short compass, of the organization adopted, and the completeness with which it was carried out, and we are tempted to quote it in full:—

"Next, after completing the transport arrangements and bringing all the country carriage into the field, the most urgent matter was the organizing of the relief system according to the rules of the 26th January, already mentioned in chap. i. My visits to all the most distressed tracts of country satisfied me that if relief operations were (according to those rules) to be inspected at least once a week, and if supplies were to be distributed in every severely distressed village, these tracts must be parcelled and mapped out into circles, each circle to contain from fifty to one hundred villages, to be supervised by a superior European or native officer, with a staff of subordinates, among whom would be divided the duty of inspecting all the villages, and with at least one grain depôt from which might be supplied the granaries to be established at convenient places within the circle; that, in short, the unit of relief administration must be the circle, with an organization of its own sufficient for all branches of the relief work. The officer in charge of a circle would be the immediate executive authority and administrator of relief; to him would be entrusted the safety of the lives of the inhabitants of his circle; and of him would be demanded all the best practical qualities of a civil officer. The boundaries of the circle throughout the more distressed tracts, and the place for the head-quarters of each circle, were determined with all possible expedition. The construction of temporary habitations at these various head-quarters was taken in hand. It was expected that there would be at least 150 such circles. The selection of circle officers of the requisite ability for so many circles, was the first care. The next thought was the collecting and disposing of the circle subordinates. Each circle would need, on the average, ten inspectors for the visitation of the villages. For each inspector's sub-circle one granary would be needed (that is, ten granaries to a circle), and each granary must have a storekeeper. Then the circle officer must have storekeepers for his central depôt, and one or more native clerks. Thus, each circle must have, on the average, twenty-five subordinates of some education and training. The number to be found for 150 circles would be about 3,500. Besides these, which might be termed the fully organized circles in the most distressed tracts, there were to be in the less distressed districts many circles and relief centres, with

Digitized by Google

a less complete organization. For these, also, many hundreds of trained officials would be required." (Page 16.)

We have now only space to select a few facts to illustrate the extent of the work, and its results. We feel that they fail to do justice to the subject unless as the means of inducing our readers to learn what was achieved by our fellow-countrymen, by referring to this remarkable document itself.

At the highest point of distress, four-and-half millions of per sons were receiving support from the State, either as charitable relief, or wages on the relief works and indirectly through advances made to private employers.

A sum of one and three-quarter millions sterling was spent on roads and tanks executed as relief work.

Six thousand six hundred miles of road were partially or wholly constructed.

The means of transport organized for carrying 404,000 tons of grain, generally by rough and unmade roads, over distances varying from 20 to 150 miles, after importation by sea and river, consisted of—

88 European officers of the army.
2,116 Native officers and soldiers.
104,150 Carts.
106,825 Cartmen.
212,000 Draught bullocks.
1,350 Camels.
14,000 Pack animals, chiefly mules and ponies.
2,340 Country boats.
23 Steamers.

These were employed on 23 main routes of transport.

The relief circles numbered 2,281.

The depots and granaries were 2,300 in number.

The staff organized for the management of the circles, depots and granaries, numbered 6,960 officers and men European and native.

Finally, the expenditure of Government amounted in all to upwards of 9,000,000 sterling, of which £5,620,000 is estimated as the nett expenditure, after all recoveries have been deducted.

These are a few salient points in the narrative of, we believe, one of the greatest administrative feats on record, and one which by the mercy of God saved the lives of millions of our fellow-subjects. Of the labour, the anxiety, the exposure, and the endurance which these operations called forth, from officers and men, and of the cheerfulness with which they were borne, it is utterly impossible for us to convey any idea within our limits. These must be measured by what they achieved, and by the thanks which they elicited from the Government; but there was

Digitized by Google

a moment of terrible anxiety before their labours closed. The period when the pressure on the resources of Government was greatest, was naturally that when the periodical rains, upon which the prospects of the future depended, should fall. They had been withheld the year before; had a cycle of such years set in? or would the heavens yield their bounties? There were alternations of hope and fear: but God was merciful. The glad sound of abundance of rain was heard, and the people, unweakened by famine, and undemoralized by a too lavish bounty, hastened from the relief works and the stores, to cultivate their paternal fields, and again earn an independent subsistence. The rapidity with which the Government organization was dissolved, and labour, and trade resumed their normal action, is a most striking proof of the wisdom which had guided the plans of the Government, and the discretion which had mingled with the zeal of those who carried them out.

Some facts connected with this subject are so creditable to the authorities, and afford such pleasing traits of the people, that we cannot help dwelling upon them.

"*Within a fortnight* from the culminating point of distress, the period when the rain began, the aggregate number of persons on charitable relief, and relief works fell from 2,175,606 to 1,418,783;" so gladly did the great mass of cultivators resume their wonted occupation.

After agricultural labour had re-commenced there was still a period to be tided over till the crops were matured and gathered, during which prices tended towards famine pitch, and Government help was still needed, especially by the non-agricultural classes. But these, as they were able to support themselves, were gradually discharged, and this was accomplished more quickly than the authorities had ventured to hope, and (p. 40) "those who remained at the beginning of autumn, that is 1st to 15th September, were those who, in ordinary times, subsisted on charity, and who had no livelihood of their own making. During the famine the classes who are the donors of this charity, being themselves in straits, ceased to support their indigent and infirm people, who, consequently, came upon the State relief. With the prospect of returning plenty," the narrative continues, "it became a matter of serious moment to send these people back to private charity. There was anxiety as to whether the ordinary donors would resume their charitable offices. However, so strong is the force of usuage, almost amounting to religious obligation, that they must have began again to give to the beggars and the helpless their accustomed doles of food. These poor creatures have been discharged from State relief, and no harm has resulted to them. These circumstances,"

Digitized by Google

it is justly added," are certainly creditable to the industrious classes."

Other traits equally to their credit are incidentally mentioned. Thus it is stated that great exertions on the part of the officials were called for to prevent the people holding back from seeking relief. Difficulty was experienced in searching out all the fit objects of relief.

"The superior officers of circles in going their rounds in the villages to see whether the registration had been completely done, would find here and there some feeble person not included in the registers." . . . . "In justice to the people it must be said that but little imposture came to light. The authorities had rather to guard against their holding back unduly, than against their coming forward improperly. Whether from shyness, or ignorance, or resignation, or despair, they often faced mortal danger in a manner which inspired both pity and esteem.

"The people of a higher class, who by social custom could not work, and from a feeling of pride were ashamed to beg, 'drifted into a condition near to starvation' before they would seek public relief. The people of this class were, from a natural pride, often unwilling to be regarded as recipients of altogether gratuitous relief, and would endeavour to pay something, however small." (p. 28)

The following passages show that the general distress, and doubtless the generous and at the same time judicious action of the public authorities, elicited the sympathy and co-operation even of a class supposed to be the most hard-hearted. When the time came for arresting the rise of prices by throwing Government grain into the market, fear was entertained lest this measure should excite the hostility of the grain merchants. This fear proved groundless.

"I questioned the native grain dealers," writes Sir Richard Temple, "at all, or nearly all, the principal marts in Behar and Bengal, and found them unanimously in favour of the measure, provided that it was carried out under the conditions prescribed by the Government. In some places the traders urged the measure on our consideration, and constituted themselves advocates on behalf of their suffering fellow-citizens. From their own repeated declaration it appeared that they were not afraid of Government interference. From no persons have I heard stronger expressions of gratitude or more distinct assertions that the State had saved the fortunes of the traders by saving the lives of their constituents, than from the principal native merchants of Behar." (p. 31.)

Passages such as the following are deeply interesting:—

"To any one watching the sales at the petty granaries, it was remarkable to see what numbers of people, who to all external appearance were paupers, produced or raised money, and bought

Digitized by Google

their food rather than ask charitable relief. Widows, aged persons, children, and unlikely people of all classes, seemed either to have brought out old hoards or to have raised money somewhere wherewith to buy food at the public granaries." . . . . "Numbers of instances were related of widows who had sold their last remaining ornaments so as to buy food for themselves and keep their names off the pauper lists. In some places these poor creatures when they could not afford to pay the full Government price, begged to be allowed to pay at reduced rates rather than be put on the list of paupers who got their food for nothing. These grain sales secured the return of one million sterling out of the money expended by Government on bringing grain into the country."

This is indeed a touching picture, and there is no passage more gratifying in the whole history than that which gives every reason to believe that the action of Government was so judicious that it left this excellent people improved rather than deteriorated by its interposition,—grateful to its rulers, and as independent and industrious as before. "Though some persons, it is stated, here and there may have, during June last, been charged with unwillingness to quit relief, yet they have as a whole evinced a degree of alacrity," in following their agricultural labours, "never surpassed by them within living memory."

It is gratifying to find it stated that "when the good deeds done by the Zemindars, as a body, come to be recorded, the catalogue will be found to be extensive and creditable." The conduct of many was "honorably conspicuous." Influenced by the example of the Government their efforts to aid the people "increased more and more;" and though there were shortcomings and failures on the part of some, deeply to be regretted, the "conduct of the land-holders, as a body, and of other natives, was "worthy of their means, fortunes, opportunities, and social position."

Sir Richard Temple closes his report in words which it would be injustice to omit.

"Whatever may be the result of the proceedings of which the narrative is now concluded, we must be aware of the futility of mere human efforts for the averting of such a calamity as the famine of 1874; and we must be duly thankful for the mercy of Providence in sparing the lives of so many of our fellow-subjects.

"The Government of India can judge whether throughout the affairs which have been described in this report the officers of all grades, working under the Government of Bengal, have tried to act up to the resolution issued by the Governor-General in Council, in March, 1874, and whether they have striven to perform the arduous task imposed upon them with the zeal, ability, and self-sacrifice which have always distinguished the servants of the Crown and of the East India Company in times of difficulty and of danger.

Digitized by Google

"No language that I can employ will adequately express my sense of the devoted manner in which the Government of Bengal has been served by the body of its officers during this period of extreme trial."

Many reflections rise to the mind in closing the narrative of operations so vast, so complicated, and so unprecedented as those of which we have given a most inadequate summary. If some problems in political economy and administration appear to be solved or illustrated by actual experiment, others, and those of a formidable character, seem to be suggested by what we read. But leaving these to the statesman and the economist we, from our point of view, may be allowed to contemplate with devout thankfulness the scene of a Christian Government, guided by the precepts of our Divine faith, applying all the principles of enlightened statesmanship, and all the resources of its hard-won civilization, to the saving of the lives of millions whom an inscrutable Providence has entrusted to its charge, and the blessing of God crowning this great national effort with a success almost beyond hope. The ancient world has left no such picture. Christianity alone has achieved a triumph like this. And it is with satisfaction we observe that the result is not the fruit of Christian bounty, but the result of Christian statesmanship. It would have been something if the English nation had voted a few millions to aid a famine-stricken people; but it is more to have taught them, by Christian principles acting through the Government under which they live, that their own resources, duly applied, suffice for even an emergency such as they have just passed through.

The 5¾ millions which the famine has cost will fall upon the revenues of India, and be paid by the people of India. It is a large sum, but we believe that it has purchased blessings of priceless value: it has shown to the people what are the advantages of forming part of an empire so extensive that the losses of whole provinces can be supplied from the superabundance of others. The millions of lives which have been saved have been cheaply purchased if the whole cost were placed against this item alone; but it is impossible to read the following words of Sir Richard Temple—and they are noble words—without feeeling assured that much more than this has resulted from the teachings of the Bengal famine:—

"I am convinced that the people of all classes, from the highest to the humblest, regard with the utmost gratitude the policy and proceedings of Government on this occasion: they look back with extreme sensibility to the mortal peril which impended over them. Under Providence they attribute to Government their preservation from that peril. The impression left on their minds is profound, and

Digitized by Google

will prove enduring. The sentiment of lively gratitude is not confined to the lately distressed districts, but pervades all the provinces under the Government of Bengal. The native press, the conversation of the people of all ranks, the addresses and representations constantly tendered to Government, teem and abound with proofs of this. From their bearing and conduct on this memorable occasion, all classes of the people,—the zemindar, the land-holder, the merchant, the trader, the ryot, the husbandman, the artisan, the labourers, the helpless poor,—have risen in our estimation and regard. In respect to the officers of Government, their knowledge of the state of the people must have been greatly enlarged by the experience of the relief work, and they cannot but feel a more vivid interest than ever in the welfare of the people whose lives they have been instrumental in saving.

"Respecting any supposed evil legacies of the famine, I hope that they are but few. Certainly a great expense has been incurred, —about five and three-quarter millions sterling. This is an evil which cannot be overlooked or forgotten. It may be thought that a precedent has been established which, whether for good or not, still is in either case most important. If any such precedent is thus established, I believe it will be for good, though I need not discuss its bearings here: otherwise no evil legacy is perceptible. The famine relief may have not made the people better, but it has left them at least as well, morally and physically, as it found them. Some questions have been made prominent, the discussion of which may conduce to the public benefit hereafter. The insight of Government and its officers into the condition of the people and resources of the country has been improved. Public works for the prevention of famine in future have been designed. Another bond has been added to those bonds which unite the Government and its subjects. Above all, there is the moral effect of the elevated example which has been set by Government before the people at large.

"One momentous lesson the famine has left behind it for our learning: that lesson teaches us the necessity of strenuous perseverance in the course of material improvement on which the Government has already so beneficially and successfully embarked. It is only by such improvement that the country can be permanently protected from famine, and the necessity be avoided of adopting such extraordinary and costly remedies as those which have been described."

We have little to add to these remarks. We feel assured that the noble action of the Government cannot but have many valuable and lasting effects. It is impossible that rulers and people can have been associated in a great work of benevolence without forming many bonds of union which will endure after the necessity in which they originated has passed away. It will be no unimportant result if the people of India are led to feel the benefit of having among them an energetic body of English-

Digitized by Google

men capable of putting forth exertions such as were made by the planters in their behalf. It will be a still greater benefit if the organization extemporised for this emergency shall have left the seeds of something like local self-government; for the circles and sub-circles were but illustrations of that local action which is the strength of England. But the greatest boon of all will be if it leads the people of India to consider what is the true source of the strength of that nation whose every power has been put forth in their behalf, and the origin of that civilization which lavished its resources to rescue them from suffering. We cannot but feel sure that the effects of the threatened famine of 1874 will be seen in the future history of Indian missions, not because a sum of a quarter of a million sterling was subscribed by Christian sympathy, but because the action of the Government was so guided by Christian principles that private charity was hardly allowed room for action.[b]

Since this article was written we have received a letter from a native gentleman holding an eminent position in India, which is so valuable as expressive of the opinion of the people of that country, in regard to the course adopted by the Government in the late crisis, that we cannot resist the temptation to quote it here.

"We are having the S.W. Monsoon rains, upon which agriculture mainly depends in these parts. The season is quite favourable. This reminds me of the remarks you have made about the late Bengal famine. My opinion is that Lord Northbrook met this great disaster in a manner worthy of a great and benevolent power. Thousands of lives have been saved from painful death, a signal service which will be long and gratefully remembered in a country and by populations peculiarly sensible of such benefits. Whatever cold philosophy or dry political economy might suggest, a common instinct must ever shrink from the spectacle of thousands of fellow-creatures—men, women, and children—dying from the pangs of hunger. The active assistance afforded by Government in that great crisis, cannot fail to rivet the affection and loyalty of the Indian populations. The good done is not correctly estimated by the positive effects that have followed. A correct estimate must include the vast evils which have been avoided. We are not to limit our attention to the effects of action: we must take the difference between the effects of action and those which would have followed inaction. The spectacle of Government undertaking the sustenance of hungry thousands,

[b] Of a sum of about £12,000 contributed through the Church Mission Society hardly more than £3,000, if we remember rightly, was expended, so completely had the action of the Government met the wants even of the sick and helpless.

Digitized by Google

was congenial in a land where you see benevolent natives supplying food to the lower animals. I have often seen Bunniahs throwing out food to the very dogs in the street, to the stray cattle, to the very ants in open grounds! The natives cannot bear to see even such animals perish for want. You have heard of 'Pinjerrapoles,'—regular organized institutions, steadily maintained by native associations, in view to feed old, maimed, useless horses and bullocks. Such animals are shot and got rid of in other parts of the world; but here, in India, their right to life is recognised. 'Feed the hungry,' is a sacred precept in India. Princes, chiefs, and wealthy men, vie with each other in giving effect to it. In the part of India in which I am, instances may be witnessed to this day, of a most impressive character. A bell is hoisted on a conspicuous building at the capital of the chief. Every day, at a stated hour, it is sounded. It is a general summons to the hungry to come and take proffered food. After distribution, the chief's messenger loudly inquires, 'Is there any suffering from hunger in these dominions?' The words are thrice repeated. It is only when no one answers the call, that the chief sits for *his* meals. After this, I need not say how favourably Lord Northbrook's action in connection with the famine is viewed in India, and what imprecations would have followed inaction."

THE PHILOSOPHY OF NATURAL THEOLOGY.

The Philosophy of Natural Theology. An Essay in Confutation of the Scepticism of the present day. By the Rev. William Jackson, M.A. Hodder and Stoughton. London. 1874.

The Supernatural in the New Testament possible, credible, and historical: or, an Examination of the validity of some recent objections against Christianity as a Divine Revelation. By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A. Frederic Norgate. London. 1875.

It is the Divine prerogative to bring good out of evil, light out of darkness. In nothing is this more benificently and signally displayed than in the way in which the publication of error is made to subserve the interests of truth, in the re-examination which it leads to of fundamental principles, and in the more clear and triumphant demonstration which it elicits of their strength and soundness. The Goliaths of error stalk forth, and with disdainful confidence fling their defiances in the face of Christendom, and too often cause panic and confusion. To their shame, be it said, the hearts of God's people, like Israel of old, fail them for

Digitized by Google

fear, and they tremble at the blast of their enemy's challenge; but in due time a champion is raised up to turn the alarm into rejoicing. The extremity of man proves God's opportunity for the mightier vindication of His truth. The fierce storm of attack sweeps over the Church with appalling fury, and the grand old tree, under which seemed such security of shelter, so reels and sways as to cause fear of uprooting, but when the hurricane is passed, lo, its roots are found to have only struck the deeper, and its stability becomes the more fully assured. From apostolic times the history of the Church has abounded in illustrations of this, the bringing forth of good out of evil by the clearer manifestation and stronger vindication of God's truth which has resulted from the assaults on its faith. Truly may we be thankful for the doubt and denial on the part of some in the Church at Corinth, in regard to the doctrine of the Resurrection, seeing how, thereby, was elicited St. Paul's lucid exposition and convincing argument in its defence. True as is that saying, "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church," no less true is it that the inroads of error have been for the development of the truth. We have been led into the foregoing remarks from a perusal of the two works, the titles of which stand at the head of this paper. It is not without misgiving that we attempt a notice of them, for with the space at our command it is impossible to attempt anything like an adequate Review of them, and yet nothing less than a full Review would suffice to do them justice. Still, it may not be without use, both to the authors and to our readers, if without attempting any exhaustive discussion or criticism, we simply call attention to these able and valuable books, and indicate generally their character and contents.

To those at all familiar with the controversies of the day, it will be well-known that not only has the Bible, as a Divine revelation, been assailed and denied, but that even the argument from natural religion has been impugned and scorned. The supernatural, in any form, is the red rag which excites the fury of scepticism to its utmost pitch. "There is no God," is its cry, "declared in nature; the Bible is the invention of fools and fanatics; miracles are simply impossible, and, therefore, absolutely incredible; the Resurrection of Jesus is the fond delusion of credulous disciples and adherents in an uncritical period; the darkness of a superstitious age is passing away, science descending upon the earth has proclaimed, 'Let there be light,' and now in its light we see light, and stumble no longer on the dark mountains of ignorance, superstition, and credulity."

That in thus representing the thoughts and the utterances of modern scepticism, we are guilty of no exaggeration or perversion, they whose dreary task it has been to wade through the infidel

Digitized by Google

productions of the age will bear witness. It is, indeed, distressing, not only that these books should have been written and published, but that they should find so many to read them with avidity. We cannot help thinking that this unhappy readiness of receptivity of sceptical theories, which marks the present day, as evinced in the welcome given to and the circulation obtained by sceptical books, is in *some* measure owing to an insufficient conduct of the argument by writers on Christian evidence. The human mind is very subject to reactionary movements, and nothing more provokes and sets this tendency in motion than the discovery that it has been yielding its unquestioning credence to an unsustainable position or dogma. Discerning some flaw in an argument previously accepted, a recoil takes place, and the whole is as unthinkingly abandoned as before it was unthinkingly embraced. The weak point discovered may be only in a mere outwork of the fortress, but it is hastily concluded that the fortress itself is therefore untenable. We believe that this has been the history of many a mind which once held but now rejects important truths. Therefore books ought to be all the more welcome, which, while they re-state the old argument, keep clear of the mistakes or over-statements of former writers, and present it in a form adapted to the present crisis. This valuable service to the cause of Christian evidences we think has been rendered by the two authors whose books are now under notice. Interesting, and in part most satisfactory, as is the argument of Paley in his Natural Theology, yet it is not without its weak points, which friendly critics, like Lord Brougham and Dr. Whewell, have not hesitated to point out, and which opponents have not failed to pounce on. The time was when this book was almost idolized; perhaps, few books enjoyed a greater acceptance or were more commonly appealed to. Of late years, however, its reputation has waned, and the argument itself has suffered in appreciation. In a similar, but in a yet more signal manner and degree, the true argument which may be founded upon miracles has suffered depreciation from the use made of them by Paley and writers of his stamp.[a] We do not hesitate

[a] It is but right in estimating the value of Paley on controversy, to adduce the following remarkable story. An eminent Missionary, now in India, had, in his youth, been an infidel: he was familiar with Gibbon, Volney, Voltaire, Diderot, Strauss, and others. He had persuaded himself that Christianity was not a revelation from God, that there was no revelation; that there might be a God, and probably was, but there was no life to come. For eleven years he continued unshaken and unwavering in unbelief. By what some would term an accident, instead of a book which he required, he by mistake took out Paley's Evidences from a public library. Being unable to return it the same day he glanced at it, then read a good portion of it. Some few days after he carefully read it again, to see if there was any reason to believe the Bible was from God. When about half way through the volume he offered the prayer,

Digitized by Google

to avow our own conviction that as the argument is conducted by Paley, it cannot *as a whole* be sustained. Deut. xiii. alone is fatal to it. Were this all, however, were a mere correction of the argument only necessary, the task had been comparatively easy, but opponents have to be met who not only demur to the conclusion drawn from the premisses, but deny *in toto* the premisses themselves, averring that there never have been, and cannot be such things as miracles.

In view, therefore, of the mistakes of friends, and the fierce onslaught of enemies, it is indeed matter for congratulation when writers come forward competent to rehabilitate the argument, and to meet with power and learning the sceptics of the day. And such we have in Mr. Jackson and Mr. Row, who have both shown themselves equal to the task they have undertaken. Mr. Jackson's book we regard as one of singular ability and ingenuity. It originated as an Essay, written in competition for a prize offered by a person unknown "for the best Essay in confutation of the Materialism of the present day, by arguments derived from evidences of intelligence, design, contrivance, and adaptation of means to ends in the universe, and especially in man, considered in his moral nature, his religious aptitudes, and his intellectual powers, and in all organic nature." The essay itself is, Mr. Jackson tells us, the expansion of a small volume, previously published by him in 1870, upon the question, "Under what conditions is a science of Natural Theology possible?" Natural Theology, considered as a science, having been at that time pronounced extinct and impossible by very eminent authorities. While putting in a plea for an unduly neglected branch of philosophy, Mr. Jackson does not hesitate to avow his own conviction that the contempt into which it had fallen was owing to the method employed in treatises on this once popular science, that method being both inadequate and suicidal.

We fairly warn our readers that they will find Mr. Jackson's book not an easy one to master. Though admirably lucid in style, and clear in arrangement, the subject matter is too profound, and the discussion too elaborate to require other than a very close and sustained attention, and the more so from the particular method which our author adopts in the conduct of his argument, viz., that of consilient proof. This method, which is a leading feature of the book, and one very ably pursued, may

"Help Thou, mine unbelief." When he had reached the last sentence his doubts were all removed: he was perfectly convinced of the truth of the Scriptures. He has since observed, "Paley's Evidences has been the means of bringing many unbelievers to a knowledge of the truth. We say not that it is the book best adapted to all phases of scepticism: we do not think that it is; but to an out-and-out unbeliever of a logical turn of mind, we believe it is well adapted."—Ed.

Digitized by Google

best be explained in his own words, as consisting in the combination of two totally different kinds of proof; one drawn from a survey of the world we live in, the other from what is nearer to ourselves, the moral truth given us by our personal consciousness. If any particular weakness alleged against one proof cannot be incident to the other, and if both lines of evidence (kept apart while under examination) meet at last in the same result, the inquiry may be presumed to have arrived at a demonstrably certain conclusion.

Having thus explained the characteristic method of the book, we regret that we are unable to do more than briefly indicate its contents, as given in the synopsis prefixed to each chapter. The introductory chapter lays down the questions proposed, and shows the necessity of asking them; illustrates what may be termed in art-phrase the *motives* of the essay; describes its method, and explains the readiest mode of studying Natural Theology. The second chapter enters upon an examination of the kind of reasoning involved in the argument from design, and an inquiry into its special force. These investigations are accompanied by illustrative examples of analogy in different shapes. The most powerful objections against this argument, and the various modes of stating it, are then described and criticised. A re-statement of the whole line of thought is followed by the outline of a proposed method for the constructive science of Natural Theology. The chapter closes with a corollary on efficient and final causes. The third chapter may be characterized as a parallel between the difficulties alleged to be fatal against Theism, and the difficulties attaching to very various departments of human knowledge, embracing its most necessary, and its most certainly accepted kinds. From this parallel the conclusion becomes evident, that whoever accepts one set of truths cannot be debarred by these or similar difficulties from accepting the higher truth likewise. That such an acceptance is natural and valid appears further evident from the fact that a knowledge of God belongs to the class of practical beliefs, and is enforced by the same reasonable necessity. This topic forms the transition to chapter iv., on "Our Reasonable Beliefs," the main object of which is to establish a tenable theory respecting those human beliefs, among which is included our primary belief in Theism. Their nature and validity not having as yet been sufficiently investigated, some extent of discussion attends the inquiry. To many readers the territory opened out will appear new. It ought, however, to be traversed by all careful students of psychology. The argument of the fifth chapter turns upon the analysis of concrete processes carried on throughout human life; together with their correlations or correspondent factors visible *in rerum*

Digitized by Google

natura. All these being complex activities, resolve themselves into series of simpler activities, which, though separable in thought, follow each other inseparably, as real working elements of human or natural productions, or of both. The main object of the sixth chapter is to distinguish the physical chain of sequency from causation properly so termed. In other words to divide the world, as we see it, into two spheres; the mechanical and the personal. The former is characterized by invariable sequency. The latter by causation, and by causal interference with the mechanical chain of antecedent and consequent. Inferences are drawn from these contrasted facts. The object of the seventh chapter is to show that the universally enforced maxim of responsibility unites in itself *two* factors.

(1) A true power of causation, as explained in chapter vi.

(2) A moral distinction of right and wrong.

This *second* element of responsibility is next investigated, and the moral antithesis shown to be inalienable. Right can never be wrong, nor wrong ever right. Justice must certainly prevail at last. From the connection of morality with causation, it may be inferred that the moral law has its ultimate existence in a supreme Personality—a just and sovereign God. This conclusion is verified. Human life and human death read us the same lesson.

Corollary.—If the conclusion just drawn be accepted, and to know God be life eternal, we may also infer an *a priori* probability of some supernatural assistances, intended to strengthen our human weaknesses and diminish our ignorance. This latter purpose would seem likely to include a better aid to happiness, and a more complete code of moral maxims.

The last four chapters argue for the truth of Theism on four several and independent grounds. These arguments are purely constructive; and each is so far apart from the other three as to stand or fall upon its own merits. But, when each of these four arguments has been separately examined, if admitted either wholly, or in a modified shape, their consilient and conjoint effect must be taken into consideration.

It only remains to be noticed that either in foot notes, or as additional notes at the end of the chapters, the author has supplied a large number of quotations illustrative of particular expressions, sentences, and paragraphs, explaining and confirming principles of great importance to the argument, and presenting in their own words the views of those sceptical writers against whom the book is directed. We close our notice with our hearty thanks to Mr. Jackson for his book, and with an assurance to our readers that it will amply repay the labour of studying and mastering it.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Row's work is of a more popular character, having been written at the request of the committee of the Christian Evidence Society, "in refutation of certain principles, now widely disseminated, which impugn the supernatural elements contained in the New Testament." It is, we suppose, pretty well-known that a certain book entitled, "Supernatural Religion," has recently been published, and has obtained an unhappy notoriety. It is a melancholy proof of the temper of the day that this book, abounding as it does in blunders, mis-statements, and plagiarisms should find extensive acceptance; but this being the case it is desirable that means should be taken to counteract and neutralize its mischievous influence. The committee of the Christian Evidence Society, therefore, have done well in asking Mr. Row to undertake this task, and we gladly and thankfully bear witness that he has well and ably executed it. His discussion of the subject is comprehensive and thorough, and what we specially like in it is, that he fairly faces the points and arguments of his opponents, and deals with them unfalteringly and decisively. At the outset he accepts the statement of the author of "Supernatural Religion," of the points at issue, as between those who affirm, and those who deny that Christianity is a divine revelation. "I cordially accept," he says, "the position laid down by the author of 'Supernatural Religion' as a correct statement of the case, that Christianity involves the presence of the supernatural, or it is nothing. We must either defend the chief supernatural elements of the New Testament, or abandon it as worthless." On this battle ground he closes with his opponent, and in our judgment gives him an ugly fall.

We are glad to see the special attention which Mr. Row has given to that oft-repeated allegation as to the credulity of the disciples of Jesus, especially in its relation to the trustworthiness of their testimony to the resurrection of our Lord. To this is added an interesting chapter on the love of the marvellous in mankind as affecting the credit of the testimony to miracles. Our author has clearly discerned the key of the position occupied by modern unbelief, and has wisely directed his forces against it.

It may, perhaps, be useful and acceptable to our readers if we place before them a brief outline of Mr. Row's book. After an introductory notice of the points to be controverted, on the one hand, and to be established on the other, followed by a careful and necessary definition of terms occurring in the discussion, our author proceeds to inquire what is the extent of Supernaturalism asserted in the New Testament, and what is the degree of evidential value its writers claim for it: what it is they affirm to be proved by miracles? Conceding the existence of God as the

Digitized by Google

source of all the forces which exist in nature, yet proclaiming Him at the same time to be unknown and unknowable, sceptics raise a primary objection to the *possibility* of miracles. The validity, therefore, of this position is examined, because could it be sustained, anything like a real revelation of Him would be impossible. Other objections to miracles are then considered, especially those connected with demoniacal possession, which are made by the author of Supernatural Religion a special ground of attack. Two chapters are next devoted to a consideration of the objections before alluded to, the credulity of the adherents of Christ in particular, and the love of the marvellous in mankind generally. We unquestionably ourselves reject a great deal of alleged Supernaturalism without thinking it worth while to inquire into the evidence on which it rests: the grounds on which we do this is, therefore, inquired into, and how far it affects the credibility of miracles. Sceptics allege that the Supernaturalism of the Gospels rests on no reliable testimony: the historical evidence, therefore, on which our belief in miracles depends, and especially as it affects the truth of Christ's resurrection, is very fully and ably discussed. To this portion of Mr. Row's book we attach great value, for it will meet the needs of many a troubled mind, unsettled by the subtle attacks of sceptics.

Since the foregoing was written a copy of the Annual Address of the Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain, has reached us. It is by the Rev. Robert Main, "Radcliffe Observer," and is both able and interesting. It is indeed pleasant in this day of scientific scepticism to see men of high repute in the world of science associated together for the defence of God's truth, and boldly declaring before their fellow-men that the further they penetrate into the laws that govern the universe, the more are they persuaded of the glory and goodness of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. If there be giants of learning and research opposed to us, thank God that we too have giants of superior learning and research, gifted also with wisdom and piety to confront them, as champions on the side of the Lord and of His Anointed.

PILGRIM MEMORIES.

Pilgrim Memories. By John S. Stuart Glennie, M.A., etc. London: Longmans, 1875.

It is not our usual custom to notice books of a noxious character, —a wise discretion, leaves them, after their brief parade in

Digitized by Google

public, to perish from the corruption inherent in them. Very few infidel books have survived in England, and obtained extensive circulation. Much evil has however accrued from those which have been written with power and intelligence, but the number of them has been small. Mr. Stuart Glennie's book is not among them. We should therefore under ordinary circumstances have passed it over in the same silence which we have preserved concerning Mr. Bradlaugh and the late Mr. Holyoake's performances. In point of ability he is not their equal, but he has an equal desire to work mischief. The fact is we were attracted by the title: "Pilgrim Memories, or Travel and Discussion in the Birth Countries of Christianity, with the late Henry Thomas Buckle." We did not, nor do we know who Mr. Stuart Glennie is, but we thought it possible that it might be a record of some effort to redeem the poor sceptic from his errors and delusions. It turned out to be merely an account of the author's squabbles with Mr. Buckle about their respective forms of infidelity, for infidelity has its differences as well as Christianity; but so far as the book before us goes, they are more recondite and unintelligible than the most extravagant heresies which distracted the early Christian Church.

The account which Mr. Stuart Glennie gives of the last days of his friend Mr. Buckle, is the only part of the book which can be of any interest. He met him at Souân, seven hundred miles up the Nile. About six weeks after he met him again at Cairo. From Alexandria Mr. Buckle wrote to him that "he was conscious of an immense increase of brain power, grasping great problems with a firmness which at one time I feared had gone from me for ever." We do not know whether as a specimen of these problems our author immediately adds a further extract from Mr. Buckle's letter: "Tobacco and pipes are very cheap; everything else is enormously dear: ale two shillings a bottle, soda water one shilling," etc. A most ludicrous description is given (p. 71) of Mr. Buckle's costume when travelling in the desert. It is quite evident even from it that he was wholly unfit to be a traveller in the East. Indeed, it would be difficult to imagine any journey more unsuitable for a "professed epicure," of effeminate habits, who had spent his whole life among books and in study, without any early habit of bodily exercise, and had not for twenty years mounted a horse, till he was riding all day long under a Syrian sun. It is quite pitiable to read the account of his journey,—struggling on with painful effort, and often failing through sheer exhaustion, until he managed with much difficulty to reach Damascus. One evening he suddenly sprang up with a cry, wild and delirious looking, exclaiming, "I am going mad!" He was carried out of the room. "His incoherent utterances were most

Digitized by Google

painful to listen to." The next day he was somewhat better. The day following, his friend Mr. Stuart Glennie, being assured by the doctor "that there was no danger," and who if he had stayed with him "would have had to forfeit the contract which he had made for his tour in the Lebanon," left him—to die. Twenty-four hours afterwards Mr. Buckle became insensible. By the help of violent stimulants, he rallied so far as to become semi-conscious for a brief space. He soon after relapsed into a state of coma, and quietly expired. An American Missionary and the acting British Consul supplied Mr. Stuart Glennie's place, and watched over the dying man till the last.

It is not often that what is called the religious world obtains an insight into what constitutes the happiness of philosophy. We have heard the "*summum bonum*" tersely enunciated as "money in the three per cents, and plenty of it." This was the naked utterance of a worldly man. One step further, but how much further is doubtful, is Mr. Buckle's theory. He and his friend at the foot of the ascent of Anti-Lebanon, under a grandly spreading oak, had their carpets spread.

"Here Mr. Buckle spoke of the happiness,—till his recent great and single grief,—the happiness of his life. For a year, when about twenty, he had had a great annoyance, rather than grief. But since then he had had merely years of almost unbroken happiness: first the plan of a great work gradually becoming clearer to him; then every easement, furtherance, and facility, in the execution of his plan; and finally, almost instant and universal recognition and applause on the publication of his first volume. Nor was it the final triumph only, but the long quiet years of work that were with heartfelt pleasure recalled,—the delight of increasing composition, the comfort of recruiting and stimulating meals, and the pleasure of evening reading. And all the books he had read or referred to were within the walls of his own study, or the other rooms of his own and of his mother's house; for his fortune was ample enough to enable him to collect the largest private library in London, and yet save money every year. Few men are thus rich enough for their hobbies even, and yet never spending their full incomes. Yes: his life had been very happy."

We make no comment upon this, we leave it to speak for itself: plenty of books to read, plenty of well-cooked victuals constitute happiness! To do Mr. Stuart Glennie justice, he thought his friend's view of happiness a very superficial and a very false one.

We do not care to discuss or comment upon the vulgar blasphemies with which the author has disfigured a book which, where it happens to be intelligible, is not only revolting to religious feeling, but also to decency and ordinary propriety; still less do we care to follow him into the jargon which he has uttered by way

Digitized by Google

of philosophical discussion. The counterpart of it may be found in some portions of what Alice heard in Wonderland, of which we were several times forcibly reminded. It is only fair to Mr. Stuart Glennie, however, to say that, like a knight in the search of the San Greal, his great ambition is to discover a certain general law of thought. He thinks he has found it approximately, and he states it as follows:—"There is a change in our conceptions of the causes of change, which may be defined as an advance from the conception of one-sided determination to that of mutual determination." Mr. Buckle thought he understood this: it was however plainly beyond him. We place it before our readers, simply as uttered. It is tantamount to pure gibberish. The rest of Mr. Glennie's lucubrations are quite in keeping with this specimen: they are all of them equally unintelligible.

From these transcendentalisms, to descend to so low a level as ordinary grammar,—which in the middle ages was held, and we think not unreasonably so, to be at the foundation of learning, or rather the ordinary portal to it,—we will quote a sentence from the author's preface. He is very fond of indulging in flights of eloquence, and this is one of them. It occurs in a portion of his book with which usually more than ordinary pains are taken. Mr. Stuart Glennie says:—

"I would fain hope that in it (his book) there may be still truth and truthfulness enough in it ever to give me pleasure in associating with these memories of Oriental pilgrimages those mountain and forest scenes of the north, amid which they were recalled. The German forest, with its sunsets behind a ridge of pines, that cresting the deep shadow of a long wooded ravine, stood out in a black fret-work against crimson and gold; and the Scottish forest, where he (*sic*) sank in a grandly tumultuous sea of bare mountain summits, athwart which, under a heaven of every magnificence of colour, there was shed every tender and every tragic tone of that darkness and light which is the most significant symbol, or material expression, of the fact of our spiritual existence."

These are brave words: but when we made an effort to understand them, we found ourselves utterly foiled. Who was *he?* We did not think it could be "the German forest" sinking in the Scottish one; and yet there was no other antecedent to the pronoun in the sentence. We looked further back, and a page beyond: we came upon Lord Bacon, but he did not sink in a "grandly tumultuous sea of bare mountain summits," but rather in a sea of infamy. A story then recurred to us of a celebrated American revivalist preacher, who hurried away by the exuberance of his eloquence, exclaimed, "I have lost track of the nominative case; but, my brethren, one thing I know,—I am bound for the kingdom of heaven." We would not have adverted to the

Digitized by Google

singular manner in which Mr. Stuart Glennie has lost track in his grandiloquent utterances; but this obfuscation of common sense in sesquipedalian words, is the characteristic of his book, and the snare of whatever intellect he possesses. As he has "lost track" in his preface, so he has, in our judgment, throughout his book. We hope he may yet recover it; and from his present devious courses, which apparently lead no whither, find himself at length bound for the kingdom of heaven. His present book is a long sentence without a nominative case,—that is, verbiage, without a guiding principle, in which the reader will find himself as inextricably lost, as we suspect the author has been. It may be the quintessence of philosophy, but it has a remarkable likeness to a *caput mortuum* wherein is no residuum of common sense surviving.

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. VI.

The Fulfilment of the Sacrificial Rites in Christ.

HAVING completed our survey of the Old Testament ritual, we proceed to consider its fulfilment in the New Testament. We pass from the many shadows to the one substance,—from the law to the Gospel, from Moses to Christ.

Accustomed as Jews were from their infancy to the altar services, which had come down to them through many generations from the time of Moses, we can readily understand that the mental revolution which they had to undergo when they turned to Christ, was no slight one. Accordingly, God in His wisdom had made preparation in the prophetical writings for the introduction of a new and better covenant, which should be established on better promises, and should do away with the remembrance of sin altogether. Thus we read in Jer. xxxi. 31—35: "Behold, ... I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers; .... I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; .... they shall all know Me: .... for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Other passages pointed to the coming of One to whom the sacrificial terms generally used with reference to a sin-offering, should be applicable. Thus we read in Is. liii. 4: "Surely He hath *borne* our griefs, and *carried* our sorrows;" and in the sixth verse, "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all;" in the eighth, "For the transgression of my people was He stricken;" in the tenth, "Thou shalt make

Digitized by Google

His soul *asham*" (*i.e.*, guilty or a guilt-offering); in the eleventh, "He shall *bear* their iniquities:" in the twelfth, "He *bare* the sin of many." Others, again, implied the imperfection of the Levitical system, and taught that it was to give way before the presence of the Messiah, who spake by the mouth of David, in anticipation of the course he was to pursue, in the following terms: "Sacrificial feast and *minchah* (or meat-offering) Thou dost not desire; mine ears hast Thou opened: ascending-offering and sin-offering Thou dost not ask for. Then I said, Behold, I come: in the roll of the book it is written concerning me (*i.e.*, that which is written in the law really concerns ME), to do Thy pleasure, O my God, is my delight: yea, Thy law is within my inmost heart." (Ps. xl. 6—8.) Here was the dawning of the true light.

When the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world, His very name was intended to teach that He was manifested to save His people from their sins (Matt. i. 21), though the way in which He should do so was not clearly laid down. Salvation was the national word of the Jews, who were always taught to look to God for it. Jesus Christ was to be its embodiment: "Behold, thy *salvation* cometh." And so the aged Symeon rejoices, as he holds the Child in his arms, saying, "Mine eyes have seen Thy *salvation*."

The first public announcement of the atoning aspect of the Lord's salvation, is to be found in that short but pregnant sentence of John the Baptist: "Behold the Lamb of God, that lifteth up, taketh on Himself, and so beareth away the world's sin." (John i. 29.) "The Lamb." Was this word used simply as an indication of the spotless innocence of Christ? No careful and candid student of the Old Testament could come to such a conclusion. Every Jew was familiar with the question asked, so far back as Gen. xxii.: "Where is the Lamb[a] for the ascending-offering?" Evidently Isaac was in the habit of seeing such an offering presented to God on the altars which his father had built at the various places where he called on the name of the Lord. "My son," replied the old man, "God will provide for Himself the lamb for the ascending-offering." These words, spoken on the way to Mount Moriah twice eighteen centuries ago, were in John's time about to find their accomplishment. The day of Christ, which Abraham saw beforehand with exceeding joy, was now coming.

During His short sojourn upon earth, the Saviour constantly drew attention to Himself as the divinely-appointed source of

---

[a] The Hebrew word *seh*, used in this passage, applies to either a lamb or kid; but *ceves*, a lamb, is the word generally adopted in the Levitical law.

Digitized by Google

help in every time of need, as the means of sustenance for body and soul, as one whose flesh was food indeed and His blood drink indeed, and as one who had power on earth to forgive sins. He also taught His followers He was about to give His flesh for the life of the world,—to give His life as a ransom for many, and to shed His blood for many for the remission of sins. These expressions were all intended to be remembered *afterwards*. They were landmarks in His conversation and life, pointing to the great end which He came to accomplish by the will of God. On the night in which He was betrayed, the Lord was particularly explicit. He plainly taught that His body was about to be given or broken in behalf of His people, and that His blood was to be shed for the ratification of the New Covenant, whereby there should be a permanent way of pardon for sin.

The crucifixion, with all its attendant circumstances, followed. After suffering the indignities spoken of beforehand in the Psalms and Prophets, the Holy One and the Just was lifted up from the earth and hanged upon a tree, as an accursed object. The soldiers parted His garments, and cast lots for His vesture; the leaders of the people stood staring and mocking, saying, "He saved others, Himself He cannot save;" but the Saviour, fully conscious of the task He was accomplishing, continued to drink meekly and obediently the cup which His Father had given Him. At length, "when He had received the vinegar,"—when the predictions of the prophets were fulfilled,—He bowed His head, and gave up the Ghost, saying, "It is finished: Father, into Thy hands I commend my Spirit." Thus He poured out His soul unto death, having made intercession for the transgressors, and having borne the sins of many. From His riven side there came forth blood and water, as a testimony that He was dead, and as a symbol of His atoning and sanctifying work. Men looked on Him whom they had pierced; but not a bone of Him was broken, for within three days He was to rise again.

It seems improbable that even the most intimate followers of the Lord understood beforehand the real meaning of these things. They were too much in the thick of the events. A veil was still on their hearts, as they read the Scriptures and attended the Temple services. They believed in the Lord, and loved Him and followed Him; they felt that He was the One whose coming was foretold in the law and the prophets; but they could as yet see but a little way into the interpretation of the signs, or of the things signified.

The full bearing of the events connected with the Lord's death, and their fulfilment of Old Testament type and prophecy, were expounded by the Saviour Himself to His disciples shortly after His resurrection. Accordingly we read in Luke xxiv. 44—47:

Digitized by Google

"And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Doubtless as the Lord spake these words, the Holy Spirit enabled them to realize how the rites of the Old Testament were fulfilled in Him who had died for their sins, and who now stood before them, alive from the dead. The "new and better way" stood open, and they entered in with great joy.

The addresses recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, in the second, third, fourth, and thirteenth chapters, give us some idea of the mode in which the nature of the work of Christ was first announced to the Jews. But we must remember that we only have portions of these addresses (see Acts ii. 40); also that the attention of the people had specially to be drawn to the facts of the Lord's history, and particularly to the truth of His resurrection, while the doctrines which underlay those facts could only gradually be expounded to them as they were able to bear them. After the Christian Church was once formed, it continued to thrive on the Apostolic teaching or doctrine. But its members were still constantly in the Temple, and thousands remained zealous of the law for many years. (See Acts xxi. 20.) Thus the Levitical ritual was not suddenly discarded, but as Christians advanced in knowledge they learned that by entering into the New Covenant they had no need of those rites which were only symbolical of the true way of atonement. These had done their work, and were now ready to vanish away. Remission of sins was to be obtained by Jew and Gentile, not through the offering of a victim by a priest of the house of Aaron, but by belief in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Acts x. 43.) Justification was the present blessing of all who believed on Him, and who thus found a blessing which the law of Moses could never give them. (Acts xiii. 39.) The Mosaic ceremonial was a yoke which none could bear, and it now gave way before the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Acts xv. 11.)

Nothing can be more clear, on a review of the Acts of the Apostles, than that the Levitical way of access to God through earthly priest and animal blood, was done away with. A new and living way had been opened, and the Apostles were commissioned to invite all men to enter in, and to find pardon and grace, not

Digitized by Google

through atoning offerings, but through faith in the atoning work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

It is to the Epistles, then, that we naturally turn in order to find out in what sense Christ fulfilled the rites of the Old Testament. Nor shall we be disappointed in our expectations. Although there is no elaborate disquisition on the types, there are long passages and incidental expressions in quite sufficient number to make clear to us what was the teaching of the Apostles on this subject.

The principle had been laid down by St. Paul in the synagogue at Antioch, and probably in every other gathering of Jews which he addressed, that all that believe in Christ are justified from all the things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. (Acts xiii. 39.) This idea is developed by him in the important argument contained in the early chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Both Jews and Gentiles were sinners. Neither the one nor the other could point to their works as absolutely in accordance with the requirements of God's law. All had gone out of the way, and had consequently failed to attain the glory of God, for which they were created. How, then, were they to be accounted righteous? The Jew, if he had reflected at all on the nature of the divinely-appointed ritual, would reply, "I look to the ark of the covenant, to the blood-stained mercy-seat, as the highest symbol of faith and hope." To that view St. Paul agrees, and he testifies that the type of the mercy-seat is fulfilled in Christ: "Him God hath set forth to be an atoning mercy-seat[b] in His blood." (Rom. iii. 25.) The bloodshedding of Christ once for all takes the place of the bloodshedding of the goat once a year; and as the blood of that goat was brought with special solemnity within the veil, and then dropped from the high priest's finger upon the mercy-seat, so the virtue of the bloodshedding of Christ penetrated within the veil into the immediate presence of God, through the mediatorial and priestly agency of Him who died unto sin once, but now liveth unto God. The Christian Jew, reading the few words of St. Paul just quoted, and knowing the particulars of the rites on the Day of Atonement, could come to no other conclusion than this: that Christ Jesus took the place of the most solemn of all the offerings,—of that one, in fact, which was specially ordered to make amends for the imperfections of all the rest. The life-blood of the goat symbolized the voluntary giving up of Christ's life for the sins of the world. The fact that the Lord was dead, and yet alive again, fulfilled the composite symbolism contained in the two goats, one of which was

[b] The Greek word is nowhere used except in this sense.

Digitized by Google

slain, whilst the other bore the people's sins away into the wilderness. The old rite indicated that God would provide something better, but it did not give perfect peace, because of the manifest imperfection of the victim. But the work of God's beloved Son, sent from His Father to die for the sins of the world, rising and ascending into the heavens to indicate His Father's acceptance of the work,—this could indeed give the guilty conscience peace, and wash away the deepest stain. Well might the Apostle pass on to the conclusion: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. By whom also we have access (or a way of approach) by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and we rejoice in the expectation of the glory of God. Being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him, by whom we have now received reconciliation. If God be for us, who can be against us? It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even (within the veil) at the right hand of God, and who is making intercession for us. Who shall separate us from His love?"

Here, then, we have briefly but very pointedly the whole of that teaching which is developed at greater length in the Epistle to the Hebrews. To expound that Epistle fully, would be to write a commentary; but it may be summed up as follows. By fulfilling the rites of the great Day of Atonement, the Lord has done away with all the lesser rites. He has passed within the veil, and ever liveth to make intercession for us. He took away the first, or temporary class of offerings, that He might establish the second, or final offering. By that one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified; and thus, whereas under the Old Dispensation the conscience of the worshipper could not be set free owing to the multiplicity and imperfection of the offerings, so under the New Dispensation the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purges men's consciences from dead works, so that they may render acceptable service to the living God.

According to both of these Epistles, the Lord Jesus Christ combined in Himself the functions of Priest and Atoning Offering. He was Priest after the order of Melchizedek, which was higher than the order of Aaron. He was King of Righteousness and Prince of Peace, conferring the promised blessing on all nations of the earth, and accepting the adoration and offerings of men, just as Melchizedek accepted the tithes of Abraham's spoil; a Priest for ever, carrying on His special work of intercession or intervention on man's behalf, up to the end of the world.

Digitized by Google

That the Messiah should in some way exercise priestly functions, was not only plainly taught in Ps. cx., and also in Zech. vi. 13, where He is called "a Priest upon His throne," but it was also taught in the prophecy of Malachi. The priests, who are there described as "messengers" of the Lord of Hosts (chap. ii. 7), are told to prepare themselves for the coming of the true "messenger" of the covenant (the words *angel* and *messenger* being the same in the original).

In order that He might be a Priest, Christ had become one with the people, sharing their nature, having some experience of their temptations, having drunk deeply into the cup of suffering; and though a Son by original inheritance, learning obedience by the things which He suffered. Such was His training for the priesthood.

Under the Old Testament ritual, the slaying of the victim was the work of the offerer; the presentation of the blood before God by sprinkling and vaporizing, was the work of the priest. So Christ, as the appointed victim, was slain by the hands of wicked men, and immediately afterwards His sacerdotal work began. Having entered within the veil, and passed into heaven itself, He ministers there, doing the reality, of which earthly priests used to do the shadow. There He has presented the blood (*i.e.*, the atoning efficacy of His voluntary death on the cross) once for all; there He is the Medium whereby all Christian prayer, and praise, and good deeds, and holy desires, ascend to God; there He is the Channel through whom blessing (the grace of the Holy Spirit) descends upon man. In these and other ways the Lord is represented to us as the Minister of the true sanctuary and of the real tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. Such is the priestly office of Christ.

In the older dispensation, many atoning-offerings had to be presented by the priest; even the most solemn of all must needs be presented at least once a year. But so far as the work of atonement was concerned, the offering of Christ was one, and consequently its presentation once for all. The inspired Record, adapting its mode of teaching to our human requirements, unfolds to us the doctrine that there was a definite point of time in which the atonement wrought by Christ for the sin of all the world, was presented by the High Priest, and accepted by the Father as well pleasing in His sight. This moment was, according to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the time when the Saviour in human nature entered within the veil. (See Heb. vii. 27; viii. 12, 24, 26, 28; ix. 11—14.)

Others of St. Paul's Epistles refer to the fulfilment of the offerings in Christ, either in so many words, or by implication. Thus in Eph. v. 2, we are taught that Christ gave Himself up on our

Digitized by Google

behalf, as an Offering and Sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour. The original words here used take us back to the terms in which the ritual of the *ascending-offering* was described in the Old Testament. Again, when the Lord ascended into the heavens, after His death and resurrection, the fact is specially mentioned that a cloud received Him out of the sight of the beholders, as if to furnish a vivid commentary on the mode in which the victim under the Old Dispensation passed into the heavens in a cloud of vapour.

So also the rite of the *sin-offering* was fulfilled in Him. This is clearly taught in the words of John the Baptist already referred to: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the world's sin."[c] Again, we read in Rom. viii. 3: "What was impossible under the law, because it was weak through the flesh, God (accomplished), having sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as a Sin-offering, condemned sin in the flesh." And further, we are taught that God made or appointed Him who knew no sin,—the sinless One,—to be Sin (or a Sin-offering) on our behalf, in order that we might become the righteousness of God (*i.e.*, righteous before God) by virtue of our union with Him. (2 Cor. v. 21.) The expressions in these passages are very strong, and in each case any Jew who read them would perceive their sacrificial import. Not only is the term used in the first of them the ordinary Greek expression for a sin-offering, but also the still more startling phrase in the latter passage, "He made Him Sin for us," is a literal reproduction of the words in Lev. xvi. 9, where the Authorized Version has, "Offer Him for a Sin-offering."

Our Lord also fulfilled the idea lying in the word *asham*, or *guilt-offering*. This is distinctly taught (in the original) in Is. liii. 10, where our version reads, "Thou shalt make His soul an Offering for sin."

The precious truth which we have been considering is taught with equal clearness by the other Apostles. St. John says, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous One: and He is the propitiation (atonement) for our sins: and not for our's only, but also for (the sins of) the whole world." (1 John ii. 1, 2.) He is within the veil with the Father, applying the benefits of His one atoning offering to the

[c] The present tense used by John the Baptist implies that the work of sin-bearing was at that time determined on, but not completed. It was effected on the cross once for all. Thus the expression we use in our Litany, "O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world," is not accurate. He *has* taken them away (by bearing them on Himself) when He suffered, the Just for the unjust. The preface in the Communion Service for Easter Day rightly says, "He is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and *hath* taken away the sin of the world."

Digitized by Google

case of every sinner who seeks the Lord. Again, the Apostle says, "If we are walking in the light, as He is in the light, we have communion the one with the other, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son is cleansing us from all sin." (1 John i. 7.) These words may be compared with Heb. ix. 14, which teaches that the blood of Christ cleanseth the conscience from dead works, to serve the living God. This idea of cleansing through blood lies at the root of all the Levitical ordinances, and is fulfilled in Christ, who as High Priest applies His atoning merits to the conscience of the sinner. Again, echoing the Baptist's words, St. John says, "Ye know that He was manifested that He should bear (and so take away) our sins; and sin is not in Him." (1 John iii. 5.) The sinless One became a Sin-offering for the sinner. "He laid down His life for us." (Ver. 16.) Once more we read: "In this consists the love, not that we have loved God, but that He has loved us, and has sent His Son as the Propitiatory Atonement for our sins." (Chap iv. 10.)

St. Peter's first Epistle, though very short, is remarkably full on this point. In the introductory words he reminds those to whom he writes that they are elect, not only unto obedience, but unto sprinkling with the blood of Jesus Christ. He brings to their remembrance the truth that by the precious blood of Jesus, the spotless and unblemished Lamb, they had been redeemed from the vain and evil course of life in which they had been brought up. Christ, he tells them, almost in so many words, is the High Priest through whom their spiritual offerings were rendered acceptable to God. (1 Peter ii. 5.) Then, referring largely to the fifty-third of Isaiah, he points out that Christ, who did no sin, bore our sins (Himself, voluntarily) in His own body on the cross, in order that, having severed our connection with sin, we might live to righteousness. (1 Peter ii. 22—24.) Again, he says, "Christ once suffered as a Sin-offering, the righteous One on behalf of the unrighteous, that He might bring us near, or present us as *an offering* to God, having been subjected to the suffering of death in the flesh." (Chap. iii. 18.)

In considering the offerings of the Jews, we saw that they were of three kinds: first, those that were wholly turned to vapour; secondly, those which were partly burnt and partly eaten by the priest; and thirdly, those that were partly burnt, partly eaten by the priest, and partly by the offerer, his family, and friends. This third group contained what are properly called the sacrifices, or sacrificial feasts, and of these, too, the fulfilment is to be found in Christ. We saw that the leading idea of these feasts was communion,—the joint partaking of one meal. This idea is simply but forcibly set forth by St. John, when he says, "Our fellowship, or communion, or joint partaking,

Digitized by Google

is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." Thus God, the one High Priest, and the offerers, are represented as sharing together in the one common food. And what is that food? May we not say, in a word, it is that *spiritual life* which is God's by nature, and which becomes our's also by virtue of our union with Christ, who was once our Offering, and is now our High Priest. There was no participation with God under the Old Dispensation, until the offerer had brought the victim to the tabernacle, and had slain it there; and until the priest had sprinkled its blood on the altar, and had caused its fat, etc., to arise in vapour to the heavens. So no one can have true communion with the Father, except through Christ. "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." "Because I live, ye, too, shall live." "In that day ye shall know that I am *in* my Father, and ye *in* Me, and I *in* you." "Through Him we both have access unto the Father, in one Spirit." Any more complete realization of communion between the Father, the High Priest, and the offerers, than these and similar passages set forth, cannot be conceived.

There was one special rite numbered amongst the sacrificial feasts, which had a peculiar significance to the Jews, and which certainly had its fulfilment in Christ. We refer to the Passover. In the midst of a most urgent exhortation against sensual lusts, which if permitted to go on unchecked in a Church might soon leaven the whole lump, St. Paul reminds the Corinthians that it was their business to purge out the old leaven of malice and wickedness. Why? Because the true Paschal Lamb had been slain or sacrificed for the people; and just as the paschal sacrificial feast was followed by a week's continual festivity, during which no leaven was to be so much as seen in the Israelites' houses, so the true feast of unleavened bread had set in, and was to continue to the end of time. Christians were henceforth to feast themselves, not on iniquity and sensuality, but on sincerity (or purity) and truth,—food for their souls, which they would obtain from God, through Christ. (1 Cor. v. 7, 8.)

It must not be forgotten, however, that the feast of unleavened bread, which began on the 15th of Abib, was distinct from the paschal sacrifice, which was slain on the 14th. The former was not sacrificial in the technical sense of the word, the latter was. The former commemorated the deliverance from Egyptian bondage (Ex. xii. 17), the latter commemorated the deliverance of the Israelitish families from the slaughter of the firstborn. We have seen the practical lesson which St. Paul drew from the rite of unleavened bread; but how was the paschal offering fulfilled? Death would have been in every house in the land of Goshen, if the blood of the paschal lamb had not been sprinkled on the

Digitized by Google

lintel and on the doorway. The firstborn owed their lives to this deliverance, and consequently those lives were due to God, who had passed over them. (Ex. xiii. 15.) And so now, the wrath of God which is revealed against all unrighteousness, passes over those who are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, and leaves them unscathed. "We shall be saved from wrath through Him." "There is now no condemnation for them that are in Christ Jesus." "He that believeth on Him is not condemned." "He shall not come unto condemnation (or judgment), but has passed out of death into life." Such passages as these teach by implication the true meaning and fulfilment of the slaughter of the paschal lamb, and the sprinkling of its blood.

Here, however, we must observe, that not only does the blood-shedding of Christ fulfil the blood-sprinkling in the Passover feast, but also there must be the feeding on the paschal lamb in the one case, as in the other. This was essential in the case of a sacrifice, properly so called. Accordingly the Christian is called upon to feed upon Christ crucified,—on His body given, and on His blood shed,—by faith, with thanksgiving.

Thus we see how the various offerings under the Old Testament dispensation received their fulfilment in Christ, and we can only read that fulfilment by considering His one offering in its varied aspects. Regarded as the ascending-offering, we view Him as wholly rising up to God, and being accepted as well pleasing to Him. Regarded as the sin-offering whose blood was taken within the veil, we view His body as burnt without the camp; that is to say, we regard it as suffering the shame and reproach and pain of the cross, treated as an outcast, and as the very off-scouring of the people. (Heb. xiii. 11, 12.) Regarded as the Paschal Lamb, His flesh is food indeed, yes, and His blood drink indeed; for here the leading idea is *pardon through the blood*,—the best, the most satisfying draught for the thirsty, sin-stricken soul.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. By F. Godet, Doctor and Professor of Theology, Neuchatel. Translated from the Second French Edition. By E. W. Shalders, B.A., Newbury. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke. 1875.

WE are again indebted to the unwearied enterprise and the discriminating judgment of Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, for the introduction into this country, in an English translation, of

Digitized by Google

the admirable work which stands at the head of this Review. We have frequently had occasion to express our obligations to the same firm for the boon conferred upon English students by the translation into their own language of many of the writings of the most distinguished German Commentators. We desire now to congratulate them on the success of this attempt to familiarise English readers with some of the ablest productions of French and Swiss Theologians; and we sincerely trust that they will receive sufficient encouragement to induce them to persevere in one of the most important of those international enterprises of which the nineteenth century is justly proud.

In the introduction to this Commentary Professor Godet adduces ample evidence of the existence of the third Gospel in the Primitive Church, alike from the writings of orthodox Christians, and of early heresiarchs. The rash, but confident, assertions respecting the late origin of the Canonical Gospels which have been recently made, both in Germany and in our own country, impart peculiar interest and importance to this question. Now in the case of the Gospel of St. Luke, the evidence of its early composition is very conclusive. There is strong *prima facie* evidence that the Acts of the Apostles, which brings down the history of St. Paul to the end of the first imprisonment at Rome, probably 64 A.D., was written before the career of that Apostle was finished. But the Acts of the Apostles pre-supposes the existence, and the reception of the Gospel of St. Luke. The same general conclusion is ingeniously sustained by Professor Godet by an argument derived from the concluding verses of the Gospel of St. Mark. Without entering at length upon the question of the authenticity of St. Mark xvi. 9, 20, Professor Godet notices the difference of style which is observable in those verses, and the fact that they are wanting in some of the more ancient manuscripts. He notices, further, the fact that, notwithstanding some peculiarities of expression, the verses themselves are little more than an abridged reproduction of the facts recorded by St. Luke. The explanation which he offers of the composition of these verses is substantially as follows: St. Mark, in compliance with the request of the faithful of the Church of Rome, undertook the composition of the second Gospel. Being at Rome, together with St. Peter, at the time of the outbreak of Nero's persecution in August, 64 A.D., he was suddenly interrupted in his work at chapter xvi. 8. About this time,—*i.e.*, subsequently to the composition of the bulk of the Gospel of St. Mark, but previously to its completion by the addition of verses 9-20 of chapter xvi.,—the Gospel of St. Luke appeared. By the aid of this Gospel these verses were added to the Gospel of St. Mark,

Digitized by Google

and the work thus completed was copied, and circulated in this new form.

We pronounce no other opinion on this theory than that (1), it tallies in a remarkable manner with the date assigned, on other grounds, to the Acts of the Apostles, and, inferentially, to the Gospel of St. Luke; and (2) that it affords a probable and reasonable solution of the difficulty occasioned by the fact that these verses are wanting in the Sinaitic, as well as in other manucripts, and that, whilst a space is left for their insertion in the Vatican manuscript, the verses are not inserted in it.

The evidence for the early existence of the Gospel of St. Luke is thus briefly summed up by our author:—

"The use which was made of the third Gospel at Rome, in the middle of the second century, by Justin, Marcion, and his master Cerdo, and the apostolic authority implied in the diffusion of this work, and in the respect it enjoyed at this period, oblige us to admit its existence as early as the beginning of this century. A very recent book could not have been known and used thus simultaneously in the Church, and by the sects. The place which the Acts held in collections of the sacred writings at the epoch of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (towards the end of the first or the commencement of the second century), sends us back a little further, to about 80-100. Lastly, the relations of the third Gospel to Mark and the Acts carry us to an epoch still more remote, even as far back as the period from 64 to 80." (P. 15.)

After a brief examination of the evidence afforded, both by the New Testament itself and also by ancient writers, respecting the personal history of St. Luke, which amounts to little more than that he was a Christian of Pagan origin, a physician, and a much-beloved, and faithful fellow-labourer of St. Paul in his mission to the Gentiles, Professor Godet proceeds to investigate the sources from which the third Gospel was derived.

Having observed that St. Luke himself disclaims the character of an eye-witness, and having referred to the statement which the Gospel itself contains (i. 3) respecting the sources of his information, Professor Godet lays before his readers an account (1) of the elements of which criticism has availed itself in order to solve this problem; and (2) of the principal systems which it has constructed by the aid of these elements. Amongst the sources of information to which modern criticism has referred as the origin of St. Luke's Gospel, Professor Godet enumerates (1) oral tradition; (2) detached writings; (3) Gospels more or less complete which are now lost; and (4) one or both of the existing Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

Amongst the principal systems which have been constructed by modern criticism our author enumerates the following:—

Digitized by Google

I. That of Baur and his school. These critics commonly represent the Synoptical Evangelists as deriving their information from each other. They agree in rejecting the Gospels as unhistorical, because they contain the element of miracles; and, for the most part, they ascribe the differences which exist in the several Gospels to the different dogmatic tendencies of the respective authors.

II. Amongst the critical systems which are independent of the Tübinger school, Professor Godet notices (1) that of Bleek, which makes St. Mark dependent on the two other synoptics; (2), that of Ritschl, who assigns the absolute priority to our Canonical Mark, to the exclusion of any Proto-Mark; (3), that of Reuss and others, who make two writings which are now lost, viz., the Proto-Mark, and the *Logia*, or Collection of Discourses ascribed to St. Matthew, the original sources of our three synoptical Gospels; (4), that of Ewald, who, setting out on the same view as that of Reuss, constructs a complicated system according to which our present Gospel of St. Luke is the combined result of eight earlier writings; and (5), a system which has been somewhat elaborately developed by Weiss, according to which the most ancient work was an *apostolical* Matthew, to which succeeded the Gospel of St. Mark, out of the combined materials of which was afterwards composed the Canonical Gospel of St. Matthew, whilst St. Luke re-wrote the two more ancient works, and enriched his narrative with new materials.

The general conclusions at which Professor Godet has arrived, and which he supports very ably in the course of this work by inductions from particular passages, may be briefly described as follows:

(1) The traditions agree in ascribing to St. Matthew the first Gospel compilation which proceeded from an Apostle. According to Professor Godet's opinion, this Apostle compiled in Aramaic the great bodies of Discourses containing the doctrine of Jesus, with a view to the edification of the believers in Palestine. The narrative part of the Gospel was composed in Greek, and probably by one of the disciples of the Apostle, who also reproduced the *Logia* in Greek.

(2) St. Mark appears to have composed his Gospel about the same time as St. Matthew, from materials derived from St. Peter, whom he had accompanied on his travels, and not from the Gospel of St. Matthew in its earlier or its later form.

(3) St. Luke appears to have composed his Gospel in Greece, at the same time at which St. Matthew was compiling his *Logia* in Palestine, and St. Mark his Gospel at Rome. He did not know, and therefore did not use the writings of St. Matthew or St. Mark, but derived his materials chiefly from written docu-

Digitized by Google

ments, mostly Aramaic. The close resemblance which exists, in some places, between the narrative of St. Luke and that of the two other Synoptists is explained by the consideration that the documents used by St. Luke were compilations of the same apostolic tradition which forms the basis of the two other Gospels.

The arguments adduced by Professor Godet, both in proof of the early composition of St. Luke's Gospel, and also in support of the theory which he espouses as to its sources, deserve the careful consideration of Biblical students. We will adduce a few illustrations of his mode of reasoning.

In commenting on the message of the Angel to Mary as contained in St. Luke i. 30-33, Professor Godet observes as follows on the words, "And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David."

The unbelief of Israel foiled this plan, and subverted the regular course of history; and that at the present day the fulfilment of these promises is still postponed to the future. But is it likely, after the failure of the ministry of Jesus amongst this people, that about the beginning of the second century, when the fall of Jerusalem had already taken place, any writer would have made an angel prophecy what is expressed here?" (Pp. 91, 92.) Again, in his commentary on the Song of Zacharias, Professor Godet, after observing how the ideal Salvation, as it is represented in the Old Testament, and as it was understood by John the Baptist, is here described, inquires, "How, after the unbelief of Israel had created a gulf between the expectation and the facts, could a later writer, attributing to Zecharias just what words he pleased, put into his mouth these fond hopes of earlier days?" (P. 113). One illustration of the arguments adduced by Professor Godet against the theory that St. Luke wrote his Gospel with the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, either in their present or in an earlier form, before him, must suffice. It occurs in the Commentary on St. Luke vi. 6-11, which contains the account of the healing of the man whose right hand was withered. After noticing some of the other differences, whether in the way of insertion or of omission, in the account of this miracle as contained in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, Professor Godet observes that the former of these Evangelists omits "the dramatic details" contained in v. 8, in which our Lord commanded the man with the withered hand to "rise up, and stand forth in the midst," which are recorded both by St. Mark and by St. Luke. Upon this omission he writes as follows:—

"Would he (*i.e.*, St. Matthew) have omitted them had he known them? He could not have had the alleged proto-Mark before him, unless it is supposed that the author of our Canonical Mark added

Digitized by Google

these details on his own authority. But in this case, how comes Mark to coincide with Luke, who, according to this hypothesis, had not an actual Mark in his hands, but simply the primitive Mark (the common source of our three Synoptists)? Here plainly is a labyrinth from which criticism, having once entered on a wrong path, is unable to extricate itself." (Pp. 291, 292.)

In regard to the chronology of the visit of the Magi, and the flight into Egypt, Professor Godet inclines to the opinion that they must have followed, not preceded, the Presentation in the Temple. If the supposition of our author, that it was the intention of Joseph and Mary, at the time of the census, to settle at Bethlehem, be correct, there is no difficulty whatever, but quite the contrary, in the further supposition that immediately after the presentation they returned from Jerusalem to Bethlehem. The visit of the Magi may have followed immediately upon this event, and, after it, the flight into Egypt. The intention of settling in Bethlehem would account for the statement contained in St. Matthew ii. 22, that Joseph, on his return from Egypt, was only deterred from going into Judæa by the tidings that Archelaus had succeeded to the throne of his father Herod; and, whether St. Luke was, or was not, ignorant of the visit of the Magi, and of the subsequent flight into Egypt, there is no insuperable difficulty in reconciling his statement respecting the return to Galilee with those passages in St. Matthew which record the visit of the Magi, the subsequent flight into Egypt, and the intention of Joseph, on his return from Egypt, to go into Judæa. In regard to the two genealogies of our Lord, Professor Godet is of opinion that the genealogy transmitted by St. Matthew is that through Joseph, and the genealogy recorded by St. Luke that through Mary; the former as the representative of the civic, national, theocratic side; the latter that of the real human relationship.

Professor Godet's account of the various methods to which modern Rationalists have had recourse in order to account for, or rather to explain away, miracles, is well deserving of the attention of Biblical students; and the manner in which he meets and disposes of the futile attempts which have been made to assign those which are recorded by St. Luke to any other than supernatural agency, is well worthy of the high reputation of our author.

Professor Godet's observation with regard to leprosy, which he asserts, in a general and unqualified manner, to have been of a contagious nature, needs some qualification,—a qualification which we think the learned Professor will scarcely think to be supplied by the foot note of his translator, in which he says that leprosy "was regarded as contagious in popular apprehension,"

Digitized by Google

and that this fact would justify the statement. The whole of this subject has been, and still is, involved in much obscurity. We believe that leprosy, in some forms, and at some stages of the disease, was contagious, and that the directions concerning it in the Book of Leviticus were sanitary, as well as ritual. It seems clear, moreover, that two very different diseases have, at different times at least, if not at the same time, been described under a common name. Certain cases of leprosy are supposed, on good grounds, to have been contagious; whilst in cases like those of Naaman, and of Gehazi, lepers appear to have held free communication with those around them, without any apprehension of danger from contagion being excited.

One of the most interesting portions of this work is that in which Professor Godet briefly discusses the much vexed question respecting the day of the crucifixion, whether it followed upon, or was identical with that of the Jewish Passover: in other words, whether it was the 14th or 15th of the month Nisan. The learned author, who refers his readers for a fuller investigation of this subject to his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John,—a work which we are glad to find that Messrs. Clark propose to add to their valuable series of translations from Continental Theologians,—adopts the view that our Lord anticipated the Jewish Passover, and that the crucifixion coincided, in point of time, with the actual sacrifice of the Paschal lamb. In regard to the question whether the last Supper was celebrated with or without a Paschal lamb, our author, in his Commentary on St. John, maintained the latter view. On further consideration, however, he inclines to the opinion that, although the lamb could not have been slain in the temple, it was prepared by the disciples in a private manner. In support of this opinion Professor Godet refers to a passage in the Mishna, in which mention is made of a Paschal supper *without a lamb.*

That portion of the work in which Professor Godet vindicates the reality of the resurrection, and exposes the miserable shifts to which modern Rationalism has had recourse in order to evade the evidence of that reality, is specially deserving of the attention of his readers.

Whilst assigning, however, a high place in our rapidly increasing store of exegetical Biblical criticism to this Commentary, we must not be understood as committing ourselves unreservedly to all the views expressed by Professor Godet. More especially we would guard ourselves against the supposition of concurrence in our author's views on the subject of our Lord's temptation, the narrative of which he regards as "a symbolical picture;" whilst, in vindicating the reality of the temptation, he appears to us—if his meaning be accurately represented by his translator

Digitized by Google

—to make use of language which is not only unsanctioned by Holy Scripture, but which it would be hard to reconcile with it.

In regard to the critical ability displayed in this work, which is of a high character, the portion with which we are least satisfied is that which relates to textual criticism. On this head we think we have some grounds of objection to Professor Godet's Commentary. He appears to us to decide points of textual criticism, not by a fair and impartial consideration of the whole of the evidence external and internal, but rather by the consideration which reading commends itself most to his own mind, as expressing the true sense of the writer. Now, whilst freely admitting the weight which may fairly be assigned to this species of evidence in cases in which the external evidence is equally, or almost equally balanced, we must enter our emphatic protest against the arbitrary determination of the text in accordance with the pre-conceived opinions of each individual who undertakes to interpret it. We will adduce a few instances in illustration of the accusation which we are constrained to prefer against Professor Godet in this respect.

(1) Textual critics are well aware that in place of the commonly received reading of St. Luke ii. 14, "on earth, peace, goodwill towards men," there is another reading supported by four of the principal uncial manuscripts, the old Latin, the Vulgate, and other authorities, the rendering of which is, "on earth peace, among men of good pleasure (or goodwill):" *i.e.* probably, of the pleasure of God in Christ, or in other words amongst the objects of the Divine goodwill,—*i.e.*, the elect people of God. Now, we are not concerned in this, or in the other places to which we may refer, to vindicate the one or the other of the readings in question. In the present case the external evidence is divided, and much may be urged on behalf of both readings. We object, however, to any attempt to determine the question absolutely, or even presumptively, on the ground alleged by Professor Godet,—viz., that "this use of the genitive is singularly rude, and almost barbarous," inasmuch as it is a well established canon of textual criticism that the harder and more difficult reading is *primâ facie* to be preferred to the simpler and more obvious.

(2) In his Commentary on St. Luke v., 30, "But their Scribes and Pharisees," etc., Professor Godet refers very properly to the other readings, "the Scribes and the (or their) Pharisees." Instead, however, of adducing, as the ground of his preference, the weight of manuscript authority in favour of one or the other reading, he contents himself with observing that neither of the two meanings which may be derived from the received text is "very natural," and that, "therefore," the other reading must be preferred.

Digitized by Google

(3) In his Commentary on St. Luke v. 34, "Can ye make the children of the bridechamber fast?" Professor Godet refers to another reading, "Can the children of the bridechamber fast?" But instead of assigning the want of sufficient evidence for that reading as the reason for its rejection, he observes that it is "less forcible," and that the received reading is "preferable."

(4) Once more, in his Commentary on v. 39, "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new," Professor Godet observes that it is "altogether an error" in the Alexandrine Manuscripts[a] that the word rendered "straightway" is erased; and he assigns, as his reason apparently for this assertion, that "the very idea of the parable is concentrated in this adverb." Now here, in addition to the objection already urged against Professor Godet's criticism on the ground that the true reading of the text ought to be determined upon evidence, not upon mere opinion of congruity or incongruity, we have to observe, (1) that the weight of evidence is clearly in favour of the omission of the word in which, according to Professor Godet, "the very idea of the parable is concentrated;" and (2) that whilst Professor Godet affirms that the very idea of the parable is concentrated in the word εὐθέως (*straightway*), the late Dean Alford observes, in reference to the insertion of εὐθέως, and the change of the positive "good" into the comparative "better," that "the sentence loses much of its point and vigour by the change."

We have pointed out a few of the blemishes which we think we have detected in a work of great ability, learning, and research. We trust that in a later edition these will be removed; and we repeat, in conclusion, our warmest acknowledgments to Messrs. Clark for the real service which they have conferred upon English students by the publication of Professor Godet's Commentary on St. Luke, and our earnest hope that they will receive such encouragement as will lead them to follow it up by the early publication, in an English garb, of his Commentary on St. John.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Plea for Mercy to Animals. By James Macaulay, M.A., LL.D., etc. London: the Religious Tract Society.—We have read with much interest this most timely publication, which will, we hope, through

[a] Professor Godet's abbreviation *Alex.* is open to misconception. He uses it to denote the Alexandrine text as distinguished from the Byzantine, a text which is not represented by the Codex Alexandrinus, which ordinary readers would suppose to be meant by the abbreviation in question.

Digitized by Google

the influence of the Religious Tract Society, obtain extensive circulation. There have been lately in the newspapers unpleasant symptoms that cruel amusements, which it might have been hoped were rapidly becoming obsolete, have been revived with fresh vigour. Brutality abounds, and is exercised both towards man and beast. The repression of it is hopeless, unless the spirit of Christianity can be aroused on behalf of the lower animals. Very judiciously, therefore, has Dr. Macaulay based his argument upon the teaching of the Bible, which in its concern for all created life, evinces its origin from God. He speaks of an apparent exception in India to the cruelty among heathen nations exhibited towards animals. Perhaps if he had been more familiar with India he would hardly have noticed it, so little reality is there in this exception: we can testify this from our own personal knowledge. The cruelty practised, even on creatures which they deem to be their gods, is atrocious. Unquestionably in India no habitual spirit of gentleness and mercy has arisen from the superstition of the land. The book is throughout enlivened with interesting anecdotes, which will make it very acceptable to young persons, whose sympathies it is so important to enlist. One most noticable fact alleged by Dr. Macaulay we would wish to bring under the notice of our readers:—"It was stated many years ago, that of seven thousand children who had at that time been educated in the school at the Borough Road by Mr. Lancaster, where humanity to animals was specially inculcated, ... not one had been accused of a criminal offence in any court." We believe it is hardly possible to overrate the importance of discountenancing in children practices which may seem trifling, yet nevertheless which savour of cruelty, and this upon the most selfish principle of concern for those in whom our affections are peculiarly wrapped up.

Some very sensible remarks upon the horrors connected with vivisection will be found in the concluding chapter. This horrible practice, which has long been prevalent on the Continent, and which has found too many advocates among our own scientific men, is duly reprobated. It is a matter for thankfulness that public attention is gradually being concentrated upon it: hitherto it can hardly be viewed as a national crime, for the large majority have been unconscious of the horrors connected with it. Dr. Macaulay alleges many important arguments which go to prove that the practice is not only cruel but superfluous; and that all substantial benefit, supposed to result from it, might be obtained by patient watching and acute observation. We sincerely trust that the agitation which has commenced will not be allowed to subside until this most cruel evil is, if not extinguished, yet restrained within the narrowest possible limits.

History of the Christian Church, from the Apostolic Age to the Reformation. A new and revised edition. By James C. Robertson, M.A., Canon of Canterbury, etc. London: Murray. 1875.—From time to time we have noted with much satisfaction the progress of this reissue of Canon Robertson's important work, now brought to a conclusion. It will be found most useful to students, as it is written

Digitized by Google

in a clear and intelligible style, with considerable grace of expression, and is enlivened, so far as the subject would admit, with interesting anecdotes. Readers, therefore, will be attracted and not repelled. In the references which we have made to it, on many of the most serious questions discussed we have found that much impartiality has been evinced, and that facts have been carefully stated. It is, of course, not to be expected that some errors have not been committed in a work, even when revised, ranging over so long a period, and over so extensive a field as is embraced in these volumes, nor would we be understood as submitting unreservedly to all the conclusions maintained by Canon Robertson; but viewed as a whole, this history of the Christian Church is highly creditable to him as a scholar and a theologian. It will quite take its place among the valuable historical works which the industry of our own times has been producing, and which may be accounted amongst the most creditable features of modern literature. If Romanism or Ultramontanism were the only possible phase of Christianity, and if the history of Christ's religion were indissolubly bound up with that of the Papacy, it would be hardly possible to imagine how any one could continue to profess belief in it as a religion, after the perusal of Mr. Robertson's careful and guarded statements, in which the foul institution is after all presented only as "*semireducta.*" In God's providence, however, it has not been so, and it is quite possible to distinguish between the Church of Rome and the Church of Christ. It is not in Rome, however, nor among popes and cardinals, with some distinguished exceptions, that any traces of the spirit which animates the latter can be found. Since the Reformation there has been reformation in the Court of Rome, and comparative order and decency; but previous to that period Rabelais would have been the fittest historian of the Church of Rome, as to some extent he was.

The History of Protestant Missions in India. By the Rev. M. A. Sherring, M.A., LL.B., etc. London: Trubner. 1875.—We could not undertake to say that in this volume Mr. Sherring has exhausted the important subject which he has taken in hand: it is far too extensive to be compressed within the limits of a single volume. He has, however, furnished general readers with a well-digested conspectus, which will be found exceedingly useful by those who wish to know what Protestant Christians have been doing for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom in Hindostan. Impartial judges, who bear in mind how extremely small is the number of persons in all Churches who give any heed to their Master's command enjoining upon them the duty of evangelizing the heathen, will gather from it much encouragement. Sufficient results have followed from the efforts put forth to make it evident that the work is very far from being, as some would deem it, hopeless. The history of these efforts is related by Mr. Sherring in a very lucid and agreeable manner: his volume is not a mere meagre record, but abounds in interesting detail, and is written in a laudable spirit of impartiality. He condemns with justice the conduct of the Lutheran missionaries, who uphold the monstrous evil of Christian caste in their missions,

Digitized by Google

and who do not scruple to proselytize from other Churches; but it is evidently with reluctance that he finds fault,—his manifest desire is to speak kindly of all. We cannot refrain from quoting, although we do it with pain and sorrow, the strictures which he passes on the apathy of European residents with regard to missionary effort. Severe as they are, they are true and just, and need to be widely and generally understood. "In India the number of foreign residents outside the missionary circle, taking practical interest in the progress of Christian missions, is exceedingly small. Few contribute towards their funds,—fewer still know what is being done by missionaries and their native coadjutors in their own immediate neighbourhood. Most possess a grotesque ignorance of the methods of procedure which they adopt; and from the beginning of the year to the end, the entire foreign community as a class—with here and there bright exceptions, whose very singularity, however, constitutes them 'peculiar people' in the opinion of the rest—agree to ignore missions, so far as most of its members are personally concerned. Though missionaries mix with them in society, yet the conversion of the natives is, as a subject, studiously avoided. Questions upon it are rarely put, and when they are, they are evidently the result of mere casual curiosity. As to visiting the mission stations with the object of becoming acquainted with the various branches of labour, and of evincing real anxiety in the spiritual enlightenment of the natives, and in the elevation and expansion of the Christian Church, and in showing the missionaries the genuine sympathy felt in the great work in which they are engaged,—this is practised in a most minute degree even in large cities, where the number of European residents is considerable. The moral support which English residents could give, if they chose, Indian missions do not obtain. Instead of being a help to them, they often, on account of their intense apathy, or of the flagrant immorality of some of them, are a direct obstacle to their advancement and success."

Ars Pastoria. By Frank Parnell, M.A., Rector of Oxtead. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1875.—This small brochure contains a good deal of sound and sensible advice, adapted for young clergymen, and for the most part accredited by high authorities. The author terms it "strictly a supplement" to books like George Herbert's "Country Parson." This may explain the omission of a good many topics of the highest moment: without them, if it stood alone, it would be decidedly incomplete. The counsels are rather those of a shrewd, intelligent man of the world, than of one who lays claim to be a spiritual teacher of his brethren; still we can thank him for his timely hints, which many well-meaning young men would do well to take heed to. The spirit of courtesy and consideration for the feelings of the poor evinced throughout is most praiseworthy, and is not the least valuable part of his suggestions.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

A SESSION of Parliament which has not been conspicuous for any important measures, and in which a great deal of valuable time has been frittered away in useless and somewhat vulgar personalities, has been brought to a close. For the waste of time the Ministry can hardly be said to be responsible: nor again are the recognized leaders of the Opposition to be blamed. To the verbosity of Irish patriots,—to whom Dr. Kenealy may be added, although he cannot be fairly included,—this waste must be attributed. Unprofitable as it has been, it yet may be so far satisfactory as an indication that there has been no violent antagonism of parties, or formidable discontent in the country, or serious danger menacing from abroad; if there had been any such crisis to be met the idle talk which has filled the pages of journals would have been overpowered. The most important measures passed have been one for the Preservation of Peace in Ireland, and those for the Regulation of the Mutual Relations of Masters and Workmen, and the Judicature Bill in an altered but, perhaps, not improved form. The Agricultural Holdings Bill, which is similarly to affect landlords and tenants, has also become law. Popular feeling, excited by Mr. Plimsoll's righteous indignation, has compelled the introduction of a temporary measure which will, it may be hoped, serve to protect our seamen from being exposed to endless perils during the winter season, by the cupidity of shipowners. A temporary measure has also been introduced to meet the difficulties arising out of the Brighton Aquarium case: we hope that during the intervening period between this and the next Session it will be made clear to the Government that public morality cannot be outraged with impunity, by injudicious attempts at legislation covering the desecration of the Lord's day. The only successful attempt at Ecclesiastical legislation has been the Bill establishing a Bishopric at St. Albans, which seems a wise and reasonable measure.

Storms and tempestuous rain have prevailed throughout the earlier part of the present month, not only in England, but also throughout Europe, and part of Asia, and America. It is to be feared that the consequences may be generally and seriously disastrous, and that if not scarcity, yet high prices may be apprehended during the coming year.

The celebration in Ireland of what has been called the O'Connell Centenary, which was intended as an Ultramontane demonstration, has not only proved a failure, but has also dis-

Digitized by Google

closed a formidable schism between the Priests and the Irish Nationalists. Foolish turbulence was the outward manifestation. But whether there is any reasonable prospect of governing that most unhappy country more easily and steadily through the irreconcilable differences of the factions which are tearing it asunder, seems very problematical, though sanguine persons anticipate this result.

Mr. Mackonochie, who has returned to St. Albans', Holborn, at the expiration of the period of his suspension, has been making fresh exhibitions of "lawlessness." Commercial frauds, foreign and domestic, have largely occupied public attention, both in Parliament and in the Courts of Law. The exposures have been of the most ruinous and discreditable character.

Foreign news has, for the most part, been of that description which hardly requires special notice. Unquestionably, Europe is not in a contented condition, but beyond some disturbances in the Turkish empire, and the chronic evils of Spain, there is no violent outbreak or recourse to arms which has to be chronicled.

Two eminent ecclesiastics have been numbered among the dead. The Rev. E. B. Elliott, of Brighton, the author of the "Horæ Apocalypticæ," for many years was a constant contributor to the *Christian Observer*. We hope through the piety of friends to be able to furnish a more extended notice of his valuable and honoured life. Simultaneously with him has passed away from us his great contemporary at Trinity, Cambridge, Connop Thirlwall, the Bishop of St. David's. It would be superfluous in us to expatiate upon the capacious intellect, the profound learning, and the blameless life of this eminent Prelate, who, from childhood to the grave, was remarkable for mental gifts beyond the range of ordinary mortals. It may suffice for the present to note, with thankfulness, that both these eminent men were spared to a ripe old age for the defence of the Truth, making their extensive learning subservient to the highest and truest purposes. Both, too, were alike conspicuous for their aversion from the puerilities of Ritualism and the hankering after what is substantially Romanism, which has disfigured and detracted from many eminent persons, rendering even their advocacy of the Church of England more dangerous than their avowed hostility would have been. Not in sophistry, but in the exposure of sophistry, was the delight of the clear and calm master-intellect of Thirlwall: muddle had not the charms for him which it has for inferior intelligences.

Hans Christian Andersen, the Danish author, and Andrew Johnson, who succeeded to the Presidency of the United States on the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, are also dead.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 10. OCTOBER. [1875.

ON PREACHING TO THE UNEDUCATED.

No one well acquainted with the moral and religious state of the lower strata of society can feel satisfied with the phenomena they present; and yet for the elevation of these strata especially does the Church of England exist. The question, then, is forced upon one,—when considering the talents, the piety, and the numbers of the English clergy, and the actual state even of our rural parishes (for it is of these we are especially speaking, and not of the overwhelming masses of our towns and cities),—whether the power of our clergy is really turned to the best account, or whether any defect in the mode of applying it is in some degree chargeable with the insufficiency of the result. In the present article it is our intention to offer some suggestions on preaching to the uneducated; because preaching, though not the whole, is still no unimportant department of the work of a Christian minister; and because we are deeply convinced that a great part of the sermons delivered in our country parishes is literally thrown away; that from faults which may be remedied, and ought to be,—in language, matter, and delivery,—they awaken no interest in the hearers, but leave alike the heart unmoved and the understanding uninformed.

In the first place it must be remembered that we have to study and to realize the intellectual and moral difference which exists between an educated and right-minded clergyman, and the great body, perhaps the whole body, of those he has to address. This is a difficult and painful exercise of the mind, but of very great importance. For want of it a good man may spend himself without reaching others. It is indeed our work to raise men in every sense; but we must first find their level, in order to lay hold of them and to lift them up to ours. *Intellectually* (for want of training, not of innate capacity) they are hopelessly perplexed by abstractions: they want everything served to them in a concrete form. *Morally* they see for the most part only the

Digitized by Google

larger forms of good and evil; and with regard even to these, they have been from childhood so used to an atmosphere in which their teacher could not breathe, and they are so surrounded by a low tone of society, that it is an enormous effort to them to extricate themselves from vicious habits from which he instinctively recoils. Their social law is not in favour of virtue; their religion is too often a rude system of barter,—an effort to give up the least portion of evil living, and yet have a fair chance of escaping final punishment. Now to understand the minds of such hearers many helps are needed. We should set out with a practical knowledge of our own hearts and of the great principles of Christian truth; for amidst many differences the fundamental facts of human nature and of religion are the same. Then by reflecting on the action and re-action of these in ourselves, and taking into consideration the different position of others, we go to them in some degree prepared to learn by actual experience. But after all it is by actual experience, by intercourse with them in the week, that we gain the art of dealing with them discreetly in our public and private teaching. It is by watching their remarks, and the way in which they receive ours, —by hearing from their own lips of their interests, difficulties, and trials,—by attending to all which daily, or occasionally, takes place amongst them, that we gradually train ourselves to estimate their present position and our best mode of improving it.

Perhaps it will not be out of place here to quote from a private letter of Dr. Goulburn, the present Dean of Norwich. These are his words: "I believe we very much underrate the downright irreligiousness and ignorance of the masses in both our country and our town parishes." And after an interval he adds: "Probably our sermons are (in a sense) too good at present,—too refined, too thoughtful, too systematically drawn up,—to do what is needed to be done to those lower strata: I should add, probably too advanced,—not elementary enough. I am sure one ought to shoot down more than one does; and that thus, by God's blessing, we should hit more."

A second remark on this subject sounds like a truism: in practice it is unfortunately sometimes forgotten. It is of no use to get into our pulpits unless we have something to say, some definite object in view, some truth to make clear to the understandings of our hearers and to press upon their hearts, which has first taken possession of our own, and which we are thoroughly interested in urging on their attention, as the lesson which at that time is the fittest for them to learn. Now it must be confessed that it is somewhat difficult to act up to this rule. We are apt to think that we have exhausted all the topics of exhortation and instruction; and unless the recurrence of a special season

Digitized by Google

comes to our aid, we sometimes vaguely roam about in quest of a subject or a text, with the feeling that a sermon must be prepared and delivered, even though we have nothing particular to say; that there is an effort to be made to satisfy custom and expectation,—but an effort aimless and fruitless, without purpose and without result. Yet surely, Christian men,—with all the facts which daily contact with their parishioners presents to stimulate them in their warfare against ignorance, indifference, and sensuality, and to quicken their ingenuity in devising the means of attack,—with the instruction and encouragement at hand which the lives and writings of great and good men in the quiet of their studies afford,—above all, with the exhaustless treasures of Holy Scripture, and with meditation and prayer as a never-failing resource,—surely Christian men ought never, or only under most rare circumstances, to find themselves in the humiliating predicament of having nothing to say. Ill-health, or over-pressure of work in larger spheres of labour may prove an excuse; but can the majority plead anything in exculpation but want of faith, and of diligence, and of devotion to their work? And such pleas certainly must be alleged in vain.

Closely connected with this point of having a definite object before us, if not identical with it, is the remark,—that for the uneducated (perhaps for others also) one main idea is enough for one sermon. This idea may be put before our people in a variety of forms, and rendered intelligible and forcible by every illustration we can command; but in order to fix moral and spiritual truths deeply in men's minds and memories, one truth is enough at one time. To say this is not to encourage poverty of thought; on the contrary it requires a more richly-furnished and more logical mind, more strength of sentiment and more sustained energy of intellect, to expand a thought without diluting it, to repeat it without wearying the hearers, and to direct all the subordinate parts of half-an-hour's discourse so that they shall lead up to one central idea, to which they lend the momentum of their combined forces, and which they carry to the understanding and conscience, and fix in the memory, with the impressiveness of a concentrated and repeated stroke. A School Inspector lately recommended the Master in his teaching "more of simplicity and of re-iteration." And if the school experience of many is to the same effect, it must be borne in mind that there is some resemblance between the intellectual capacity of the uneducated and of the young.

If any clergyman will take the trouble on Monday to see after the effect of his sermons, he will learn a lesson in this direction which may be humbling, but will be very useful. And, clearly, we ought to see after the effect of our sermons,—and not of our

Digitized by Google

sermons only, but of all the means of Christian life which our parishioners enjoy: we ought by household visitation and private talk to help onward those of whom we hope favourably, as well as to warn the careless and the profligate. And if some of the Nonconformists or other Revivalists may carry on the work of "inquiry" in a manner offensive to our taste and judgment, this is surely no sufficient reason why we should neglect it altogether.

A few words may be added on the language and general style of our sermons. The language should of course be as plain as possible, not only in the words and phrases employed, but in the structure of our sentences. Long and involved periods, however nicely balanced their constituent clauses, and however faultless the tenor of their logic, are quite thrown away on most of our hearers. Long arguments, too, should be avoided, where several points must be clearly held together in the hearer's mind to justify the conclusion which we draw.

Neither can it be reckoned wise to start grave difficulties and objections. They are generally stronger than the answers,—such answers at least as the preacher has ability or time to give; and it is utterly unfair to puzzle the minds of the simple or the young with those trials which belong to older years and higher mental culture. Farther, it is a grand though not unusual mistake to devote a large portion of our sermon to an essay more or less learned and elaborate, in elucidation of the text or context, or of some part of faith or practice; and then in conclusion, when our people are hopelessly wearied and sleepy, to add a few practical remarks. On the contrary, if we are to arrest and rivet the minds of the uneducated, we must stimulate their torpid intellect and feelings by frequent and pointed appeals; we must rouse them every few minutes to a fresh effort of attention, or rather try never to let their attention flag, by tones and words which they will *feel* as well as understand. And here we cannot be wrong in urging the usefulness of similitudes and illustrations of every kind, if drawn from objects or facts familiar, or which can be rendered palpable to the minds of those we address. We are only following in this our blessed Lord's example of teaching by parables, and endeavouring, as was before suggested, to exchange the abstract for the concrete. But especially will anecdotes be found useful to the preacher, such as every man's reading and experience ought to be able to supply. When aptly and feelingly introduced, these most rarely or never fail. The languid and relaxed attention is at once revived and stimulated to the utmost stretch of eagerness; and this, not only with the *least*, but with the *most* educated of such hearers as it usually falls to the lot of a country clergyman to address. One other advantage—and it is no slight one—such accessories possess:

Digitized by Google

they fix themselves, as nothing else does, in the memory of our hearers. The careful argument, the urgent appeal, however impressive at the time, are soon forgotten; but the vivid picture thus presented to the imagination—the sensible form and embodiment of the spiritual idea we would enforce—not only interests for the moment, but remains planted and rooted in the mind, whether for reproof or for comfort, as the abiding witness and indestructible image of the truth.

It is obvious that if there is any truth in the foregoing remarks, they can be best carried out by that kind of preaching which is called "extempore:" a method which undoubtedly possesses many advantages,—indeed, seems to be the only efficacious mode of dealing with the class of which we now speak. But by extempore preaching we do not mean preaching without preparation: we mean neither this, nor yet learning a sermon by heart. We exclude no amount of reading or of writing to enrich our minds and render our thoughts clear. We only mean that when we ascend the pulpit full of matter, and in sympathy with our subject, the words employed should be those which rise spontaneously to our lips as the natural expression of the thoughts we wish to convey: and those words, and to some extent the thoughts themselves, will be suggested—not to overlook a higher inspiration—by the class, the character, and the fluctuating attention of those we address.

A great master of pulpit and of senatorial eloquence,—the present Bishop of Peterborough,—never spared himself, at least in his younger days, the labour of reading and of writing; and the few notes which at last he took with him, and seemingly never referred to, represented an amount of previous study from which many would shrink. It is, indeed, nothing but a fatal facility which enables and induces any one to talk to their people for half-an-hour on a subject on which they have not thought. Such persons lose that intellectual and spiritual culture which springs from the study of Divine truth and from prayer. They preach, if fluently yet unimpressively, because their own interest has not been recently awakened on the topic they are handling; and they cannot expect the blessing and assistance of the Holy Spirit when they have neglected the legitimate means of success. But understood in the way we have suggested, extempore preaching unites many advantages: it enables us to speak more simply and intelligibly, more forcibly, directly and pointedly, than the usual written style; it gives us the opportunity of expanding or compressing our ideas, and of substituting for one another which we feel to be more suited to our hearers; it enables us, as we catch their varying expression and demeanour, to explain a clause which we see has been imperfectly comprehended,—to translate

Digitized by Google

into simpler form and language what we have unawares thrown into a more cultivated style; it offers great facilities for the easy and natural introduction of appeals, illustrations, and anecdotes. Above all it has at its command, as no reading has (except perhaps in some rare and famous instances), that wonderful and mysterious agency for acting on the feelings of others,—the free and natural intonation of the human voice. In a word it is more real, or (what is the same in effect) it is felt to be more real by our people. They may over-estimate the intellectual value of our efforts in preaching without book, and they certainly often under-estimate the learning and piety of those who read their sermons; but the fact remains the same. They feel a spoken sermon more real than a sermon read, and to be effective a speaker must be felt to be real: and they have an idea, be it true or false, that (as they are wont to express it) "if a man had it in him he could bring it out."

But it will be said, is this really the fact? Are all who have it in them able to bring it out? It must be remembered that all we are at present concerned with is preaching to the *uneducated*. Keeping this limitation in view, it may surely with some confidence be affirmed that every educated man, with his heart in the right place, can train himself to address a village congregation without a written sermon, in a way to interest, to instruct, and to impress. We remember a remarkable case where simple earnestness of piety and persevering effort have surmounted difficulties greater than those with which any clergyman ought to have to contend.

One word more on this point. A simple-hearted cottager once made it evident to the present writer that the power of the Dissenters over the more religiously-disposed poor lay not in their prayers but in their preaching. Her simple words were,—"It seems more to touch the heart." That is just it, and just what we want to do; for the way to the intellect of the uneducated is through their heart: till this is interested and warmed, mere instruction falls coldly on their ears. And for *all*, and *all through* our Christian course, how much of our real practical religion depends on the elementary fact of "the heart having been touched."

The most important points yet remain: the preacher himself, and the truths he has to declare. But vital as these points are, yet as they are not peculiar to our limited subject they may be touched on very briefly, though hardly passed over in silence. It has been stated above that to be effective a speaker must be felt to be real: it must now be added, that if we would be *felt* to be real we must *be* real. Rhetorical skill and well-adjusted intonation may on occasion simulate the fervour of conviction,

Digitized by Google

but will never have its power, and will soon be seen through and despised. Reality alone prevails with others, and brings a blessing on ourselves. But to reality must be joined dependence on the operation of the Holy Spirit, both to direct the preacher's tongue, and to open the hearers' hearts. Dr. Goulburn, in the letter above quoted, whilst reviewing the causes of want of ministerial success, has these words: "And then, perhaps, above all there is the insufficient recognition in our hearts of the sovereignty of the agency of the Holy Ghost, who will not be tied to our poor instrumentalities, but works when, and where, and as He wills."

Lastly, one word on the subject-matter of our preaching. With all care and study that the form and delivery of our sermons may be perfect, with the wisest use of every aid to impressiveness which has ever been suggested, our preaching will yet never be effective if we forget, in any sermon, that to us is committed the ministry of reconciliation, and that our chief business is to entreat men, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God. Free and present salvation for every one that will accept it, the forgiveness of sins through Christ's blood, peace with God, and access by faith into grace in which the ransomed sinner may stand, with the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, and rejoicing in the hope of his glory,—this must be fully and unreservedly proclaimed, or all our labour will be in vain. But proclaimed to what end? Not to encourage the delusion that pardon, though man's first want, is yet his sorest need; but to abolish for ever that fatal estrangement which separates poor, guilty, sin-bound humanity from the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort; to give to man,—weak, tempted, struggling with the assailing powers of darkness,—firm ground whereon to plant his foot, glad confidence to cheer his heart and nerve his hand in his life-long battle against the manifold forms of evil; to inspire him with the generous and childlike longing to do his Father's will, with the blessed ambition to grow like that loved Redeemer from whom he draws his daily life and strength, with the fixed resolve to work out to the uttermost that great salvation with which he is already invested by grace alone.

Let us add in our exhortation, that the blessed faith of Christ is not given to be the viaticum merely of the passing spirit, but rather the animating principle, the power and blessing of all our life: that it not only prepares man for his everlasting home in heaven, but elevates and sweetens every relation, every circumstance of his earthly existence,—tranquillizes the perturbations of passion, deepens the tenderness of consecrated affection, and sheds upon life's sometimes depressed and overshadowed pathway an inextinguishable brightness, streaming from the throne of God.

H. S. E.

Digitized by Google

DR. SWAINSON'S HISTORY OF THE CREEDS.

The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds: their Literary History; together with an Account of the Growth and Reception of the Sermon on the Faith, commonly called "The Creed of St. Athanasius." By C. A. Swainson, D.D., Canon of Chichester, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chichester; formerly Fellow and Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge. London: John Murray, 1875.

AMONG the traditional beliefs which were shaken by the revival of learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was one, which, since the days of Jerome and Augustine, had been universally received throughout the Western Church, which attributed the Creed to the Apostles as its authors. Erasmus did not hesitate to express his doubts on the subject, thereby drawing upon himself the censure of the *Sorbonne*.[a] But the first writer who took in hand of set purpose to investigate this and other questions connected with the history of the Creeds was Gerard John Vossius, whose lucid "Dissertationes De Tribus Symbolis," published in 1642, have formed the groundwork of much that has been written by succeeding writers.

Archbishop Ussher had already handled the subject incidentally in a dissertation "De Limbo Patrum et Descensu Christi ad Inferos," but in 1647 he published his "Diatriba de Romanæ Ecclesiæ Symbolo Apostolico Vetere aliisque Fidei Formulis, tum ab Occidentalibus tum ab Orientalibus in prima Catechesi et Baptismo proponi solitis," in which he brought together sundry examples of ancient formularies, both of the Eastern and Western Church, some of them, and these of great interest, existing till then only in manuscript. A considerable portion of Ussher's work was transferred by Suicer to his "Thesaurus,"[b] under the article *Σύμβολον*.

Bishop Pearson, in his learned notes in his Commentary on the Creed, first published in 1659, added many valuable contributions on the subject.

Bishop Bull, towards the end of the century (1694), in his "Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Trium Primorum Sæculorum," had occasion incidentally to deal with it, in replying to the assertion of Episcopius, that the belief of our blessed Lord's proper Deity was nowhere professed in any of the more ancient Creeds.[c] He adopted the opinion of Vossius, that the Apostles'

---

[a] Præf. ad Lectorem, Paraphr. S. Matth. [b] First published in 1682.

[c] Judic. Eccles. Cath., cc. iv.—vi. Works, vol. vi. Oxford, 1827.

Digitized by Google

Creed (so called), though apostolical in its doctrine, was not framed by the Apostles in the precise words or form or method in which we now have it; that it is, in fact, simply the Creed of the Roman Church, in which, but not till after the fourth century, it grew eventually into its present completeness.[d]

Grabe, who in 1705 published an edition of Bull's works with annotations of his own, undertook to prove that the Creed, however simple in its origin, was from the first longer than Episcopius represented it, and that even while the Apostles still lived it had grown by their authority, or at least with their permission, to such dimensions, that, with the exception of the clauses, "He descended into hell," "The communion of saints," and perhaps "The holy Catholic Church," it was co-extensive with the Creed of the present day.[e]

In 1702, in the interval between the first publication of Bishop Bull's work and the publication of Grabe's edition, there appeared "A History of the Apostles' Creed, with critical observations on its several Articles," which forthwith attracted no small measure of attention. "Coming out anonymously," says Lord Campbell, in his "Lives of the Chancellors," "it was ascribed to several eminent divines, and the world was astonished to learn that it was the production of a layman,"—of one, it should be added, who had just entered life as a barrister, and had obtained a seat in Parliament, and who was afterwards raised to the Wool-sack, as Lord Chancellor King. It enjoyed a high reputation, especially for its treatment of the Article on the "Descent into Hell," of which Grabe says, that the author has handled the subject so learnedly,—"ut a consummatissimo theologo haud meliora expectari queant;" and Waterland, referring to the same, says of it, that "the subject has been exhausted by the much admired author of the 'Critical History of the Creed.'"[f]

To these works on the Creed in general, or on the Apostles' Creed in particular, must be added Waterland's "Critical History of the Athanasian Creed," first published in 1724,[g] a treatise of so much research that it seemed to have left nothing for future investigators to add, unless the discovery of manuscripts previously unknown should throw light upon a subject of so great obscurity. The controversy, however, of the last few years, respecting the Athanasian Creed, has stirred up a fresh interest in the subject, and has led to fresh inquiries; and the work now under review (a work equal in learning and research to Waterland's), is in part one of its fruits.

Since the publication of Waterland's work, the historical study

---

[d] Ibid, p. 96. [e] Bull's Works, vol. vi., pp. 170—186.

[f] Works, vol. iii., p. 243. Oxford, 1843. [g] Works, vol. iii.

Digitized by Google

of the Creeds seems to have attracted comparatively little attention in this country till of late years, when, from one cause or another, an impetus has been given to it, and it has been taken up both at home and abroad. Dr. Swainson's volume, as it is the latest which this movement has produced, so it is the fullest and most elaborate. He has brought together whatsoever information has been collected by his predecessors, and has added very considerable contributions of his own. His book is indeed a storehouse of materials, too full to serve the purpose of a popular manual, but most valuable for those who desire to make the subject a study, and to go thoroughly into it.

Dr. Swainson, after some chapters devoted to the subject generally, proceeds to deal severally with each of the three Creeds with which we are familiar,—the Nicene, the Apostles', and the Athanasian,—though he does not recognise the last-mentioned as a "Creed," but, as the title of his book intimates, as a "Sermon on the Faith."

We shall confine ourselves in the present article to his treatment of the two former, reserving his chapters on the Athanasian Creed, which indeed occupy considerably more than half the volume, and which he evidently regards as by no means the least important part of his work, for a future opportunity.

After some introductory remarks, in which he complains of the neglect which the subject has met with till comparatively recent times (p. 2) (he is of course speaking only of our own country, and without reference to a period more remote than the earlier part of the last century, for the works above referred to show that previously to that time attention to the subject had by no means been wanting, even in England, to say nothing of foreign writers, both before and since[h]), he proceeds (ch. i.) to draw a distinction, on which he lays great stress, between the "Creed," properly so called,—that is, "the Symbol" or "form of words in which any Church or Council embodied its faith, and which was used as a manifesto of that faith, either at baptism or elsewhere" (p. 40),—and that fuller and more complete system of doctrine which formed the instruction given to the candidates in their preparation for baptism. (Chs. ii. and iv.)

The distinction of course is obvious, and one which it may often be important to keep in view; but we are unable to agree with Dr. Swainson when he would restrict the designation, the "Rule of Faith," to the fuller and more complete system, and deny its application to the shorter and more compendious.

The term "Rule of Faith," has in fact both a wider and a

[h] Walch, in his "Bibliotheca Theologica," enumerates a considerable number, chiefly foreign. (Vol. i., p. 302, etc.)

Digitized by Google

narrower meaning,—so wide, that it may be used, as it often is, of the whole volume of Holy Scripture; so narrow, that it may be comprised in a few sentences. The Creed is the "Rule of Faith" in epitome, and as such is itself styled the "Rule of Faith." Thus St. Augustine describes it, in words expressly to our point, "Symbolum est breviter complexa Regula Fidei, ut mentem instruat rec oneret memoriam;"[1] and on another occasion, addressing the catechumens preparing for baptism, he says, "Accipite, filii, Regulam Fidei, quod Symbolum dicitur."[1] This language is conclusive.

The very passages which Dr. Swainson adduces from Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Novatian, with the view of showing that the term "Rule of Faith," or its equivalent, is used by these writers in such a way as to be inconsistent with the opinion that it referred to a form of words already fixed and determined (in other words, to a Creed or Symbol), so far from sustaining his conclusion, appear to us to suggest the opposite. It is at least a remarkable coincidence that each of these Fathers, in illustrating what he means,—one by the designation κάνων τῆς πίστεως, another by "Regula Fidei," another by "Lex Symboli," another by "Regula Veritatis,"—proceeds to enunciate (not always, it is true, to the very letter, though often to the very letter) the substance of the common Creed; so much so, that we believe Dr. Swainson stands alone, among those who have dealt with the subject, in denying that in each case there is distinct reference to a definite formulary. If the precise words are not given throughout, this may be sufficiently accounted for, partly by the circumstance that the purposes of the writers were sufficiently answered by a fragmentary or looser statement, partly by the jealous care with which the Symbol was guarded, lest it should come to the knowledge of the uninitiated. In all St. Augustine's voluminous writings, though it is possible to collect the Creed of his Church, article by article, from the context in which each is embedded, we nowhere find the several articles set down together, and delivered as one formulary. And this reticence, he expressly says, was on principle. It is the same with other writers,—Cyril of Jerusalem, for instance, and Rufinus.

We will only add, *ex abundanti*, and as a practical confirmation of the view for which we have been contending, that the Creed was habitually appealed to in controversy, as the standard, next to Holy Scripture, by which doctrine was to be tried. Thus Cyril of Alexandria, thus Cassian, deal with Nestorius, the one testing his doctrine by the rule of the Nicene Creed, the other

[1] Serm. 213, § i., "Alias, de Tempore," 119.

[1] Serm. "De Symbolo, ad Catechumenos," § i.

Digitized by Google

by that of Antioch, and that with stress specially laid on its having been the Creed of his baptism. "In qua," he says, "cum ipse baptizatus sit et renatus, suis eum professionibus argui, suis, ut dicam, armis conteri oportet."[k] And in like manner Leo begins his famous Epistle to Flavian, by pointing out the inconsistency of the doctrine of Eutyches with "that common confession, received by all alike (communem et indiscretam Confessionem), in which the whole body of the faithful profess their belief 'in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary;'" "by which three sentences," he adds, "the hostile engines of almost all heretics are destroyed."[l]

At p. 24, Dr. Swainson has a remark which requires to be somewhat modified. After quoting from the Gelasian Sacramentary an Interrogatory Baptismal Creed, incomplete as to several of its clauses as compared with the Creed of the present day, he adds: "Later Baptismal Creeds contain some of the omitted words, but I believe none before the Reformation contains them all. Thus it would appear that the Apostles' Creed, as we have it now, was never used at baptism either as a Declaratory or as an Interrogatory Creed."

If, however, he will refer to Dr. Heurtley's "Harmonia Symbolica," he will find at p. 110 an interrogatory Creed (No. liv.), ascribed by Mabillon to the seventh century, which, with the exception of one word, "mortuum," omitted in Art. iv., contains every one of the clauses referred to; and he will remember that Pirminius' Creeds, both the Declaratory and the Interrogatory Creed, as well as one in the Gellone manuscript (to which, as well as Pirminius', he himself refers at p. 166 and elsewhere), are complete as at the present day.

For the most part, however, his remark holds good. There seems to have been great variety in the early Interrogatory Creeds. But in the Western Church, as a rule, they were an abridgment, if not of the formulary used in the service (for this was sometimes, as in the Gelasian Sacramentary, the Constantinopolitan Creed), at all events of the Church's normal Creed,—an abridgment consisting in the shortening of Articles iii. and iv. into "natum et passum," and in the omission of Articles v., vi., vii. The remaining Articles corresponded in such wise that when the earlier forms received additions in the one, they did so in the other also. Thus, when in the Normal Creed the first Article

---

[k] Cyril, Epis. ii., ad Nestorium. Cassian de Incarn., l. vi, c. iii., p. 1045.

[l] Leo ad Flav., § ii. Leo's letter itself was accepted at Chalcedon, not as stamped with the authority of an infallible Pope, but as being in agreement with the Nicene Creed and the teaching of a patriarch of Alexandria.

Digitized by Google

was simply "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem," in the Interrogatory Creed it was "Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?" When the one became, as at a later period, "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem cæli et terræ," the other became "Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem cæli et terræ?" When the one added "sanctorum communionem" in the ninth Article, the other did likewise.

In the order of the Gelasian Sacramentary, as we have already hinted, and in some others referred to by Martene,[m] the Declaratory Creed used was the Constantinopolitan. This was probably in compliance with the seventh Canon of the Council of Ephesus, which forbade any other Creed than the Nicene to be proposed to new converts, the Constantinopolitan and the original Nicene having come to be regarded as virtually one, though the Nicene also, as distinct from the Constantinopolitan, was used in some instances.[n] But the Creed in which the catechumens were instructed, and which in the earlier Church at least they were required to rehearse publicly, was the Normal Creed of that particular Church into whose communion they were about to be baptized. This is clear from the account which Rufinus gives of the simplicity of the Roman Creed in its first Article, as compared with the Aquileian. "In different Churches," he says, "additions have been made in this Article. Not so, however, in the Church of Rome; the reason of which I take to be that no heresy has originated there; and the ancient custom is still kept up, that those who are about to receive the grace of baptism should rehearse the Creed publicly, that is, in the audience of the faithful, who would at once detect and disallow the addition of even a single word." Alas, that that custom was ever laid aside! What would those old Roman Christians have thought, if, instead of the simple confession to which their ears were accustomed, they had been called upon to listen to the Creed of Pope Pius,[o] with its perversions of the ancient faith, and had heard superadded the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility!

St. Augustine, in his "Confessions,"[p] relates a touching incident, which so well illustrates the custom to which Rufinus refers, that we will venture to transcribe the passage. Victorinus, an eminent rhetorician at Rome, and held in such high esteem that he had been honoured with a statue in the Forum, had become

---

[m] Martene, de "Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus," i. 1—10. [n] Ibid.

[o] Though the Creed of Pope Pius is not used as the ordinary Baptismal Creed, yet the confession of it is required from heretics, on their admission to the Church.

[p] Bk. viii. § 4, 5. Oxford Translation.

Digitized by Google

convinced, when now far advanced in life, of the truth of Christianity, but shrank from making open confession of his faith by receiving baptism:—

"'Understand,' he said to Simplicianus (from whom Augustine received the account), 'that I am already a Christian.' Whereto Simplicianus answered, 'I will not believe it, nor will I rank you among Christians, unless I see you in the Church of Christ.' The other in banter replied, 'Do walls, then, make Christians?' And this he often said, that he was already a Christian; and Simplicianus as often made the same answer, and the conceit of 'the walls' was by the other as often renewed; for he feared to offend his friends, proud demon-worshippers. But after that by reading and earnest thought he had gathered firmness, and feared to be denied by Christ before the holy angels should he now be afraid to confess Him before men, and appeared to himself guilty of a grave offence in being ashamed of the sacraments of the humility of Thy Word, and not being ashamed of the sacrilegious rites of those proud demons whose pride he had imitated and whose rites he had adopted, he became bold-faced against vanity, and shame-faced towards the truth; and suddenly and unexpectedly said to Simplicianus, 'Let us go to the Church: I wish to be made a Christian.' But he, not containing himself for joy, went with him; and having been admitted to the first sacrament, and become a catechumen, not long after he further gave in his name that he might be regenerated by baptism, Rome wondering, the Church rejoicing. The proud saw, and were wroth: they gnashed with their teeth, and melted away. But the Lord God was the hope of Thy servant, and he regarded not vanities and lying madness.

"To conclude, when the hour was come for making profession of his faith (which at Rome, they who are about to approach Thy grace deliver from an elevated place, in the sight of all the faithful, *in a set form of words committed to memory*), the presbyters offered to Victorinus, as was done to such as seemed likely through bashfulness to be ashamed, to make his profession more privately; but he chose rather to profess his salvation in the presence of the holy multitude. For it was not salvation that he taught in rhetoric, and yet that he had publicly professed. How much less then ought he, when pronouncing Thy Word, to dread Thy meek flock, who, when delivering his own words, had not feared a mad multitude! When, then, he went up to make his profession, all, as they knew him, whispered his name one to another with the voice of congratulation. And who there knew him not? And there ran a low murmur through all the mouths of the rejoicing multitude, 'Victorinus, Victorinus!' Sudden was the burst of rapture when they saw him; suddenly were they hushed that they might hear him. He pronounced the true faith with an excellent boldness, and all wished to draw him into their very heart. Yea, by their love and joy they drew him thither; such were the hands wherewith they drew him."

Throughout chs. v.—x., Dr. Swainson proceeds to trace the

Digitized by Google

gradual enlargement of the Creed (the "Rule of Faith," as he prefers to call it, though he is continually interchanging the words, as if not fully satisfied with the distinction which he had laid down), which was made in order to meet the heresies which from time to time arose,—the Arian, the Apollinarian, the Macedonian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian heresies.

In this way he brings before us, in ch. v., certain documents belonging to the interval between A.D. 250 and A.D. 325, the date of the Council of Nicæa. First, the Epistle of the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 269), in which the Bishops there present set forth the orthodox doctrine in opposition to the unsound teaching of Paul of Samosata. This document, however, truly enough, can scarcely be classed among the Creeds, properly so called. The same may be said of the ἔκθεσις πίστεως ("the setting forth of the faith"), which, according to the legend, "was revealed to Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea by the Apostle St. John." The other documents associated with these are the Creed attributed to Lucian the Martyr, who died in 311 or 312; the Creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea, produced by him at the Council of Nicæa; and the Creed contained in the seventh book of the "Apostolical Constitutions."

The Creed of Lucian is known also as the "Creed of the Dedication," having been produced by the Eusebians at the Council held at Antioch in 341, on the occasion of the dedication of the splendid church, the "Dominicum Aureum," which had been founded there by Constantine. It was ascribed by them to Lucian, whether truly or not has been questioned.[q]

There has been much discussion as to the work known as the "Apostolical Constitutions." By some it has been supposed to belong to the latter part of the third century, and to represent the customs of the Church of Antioch of that date. (P. 57.) Whiston, as is well known, went so far as to refer it to the age of the Apostles, and even to ascribe it to the Apostles as its authors,[r] while others have placed it as late as the end of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth. The most probable opinion is that which was first suggested by Bishop Pearson,—that it is in reality a patch-work, made up of sundry writings, which, in the names of the Apostles and their immediate successors, were current at an early period in the Eastern Church. These appear to have been written at various times,—some possibly in the second century, others probably in the third. They could scarcely have been put together, however, before the Council of Chalcedon, in the middle of the fifth. Whenever they were put

[q] See the note (ν) in the Oxford Translation of Athanasius, p. 106.

[r] Whiston, "Primitive Christianity Revived," vol. iii.

Digitized by Google

together, and possibly both before and after, they appear to have been subjected to both retrenchment and interpolation, to a considerable extent.[s]

The Creed, which is contained in the seventh book, and which is given as the formulary rehearsed at baptism (a circumstance to which we venture to call Dr. Swainson's attention), contains internal evidence of a date posterior to the Nicene Council, and ought therefore to be relegated to a later chapter; for the clause, "Of whose kingdom there shall be no end," could not have been inserted before the heresy which denied the perpetuity of Christ's reign had attracted attention, and this as we learn from Cyril of Jerusalem, who speaks of it as having recently sprung up (*προσφάτως ἀναφυεῖσα*) in Galatia,[t] could not have been more than a very few years earlier than 348 or 347, in one or the other of which Cyril's Lectures were delivered.

Dr. Swainson remarks, in reference to the structure of this Creed, that it is framed, in its first and second Articles, upon the basis of 1 Cor. viii. 6: "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom (*ἐξ οὗ*) are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom (*δι' οὗ*) are all things." The same remark applies to most of the Eastern Creeds.

Dr. Swainson had noticed, at p. 50, the transition which began to appear, towards the latter half of the third century, "from the appeal to the traditional Rule of Faith to an appeal to Scripture." We have a signal instance of this in the use made by four of the documents referred to in the chapter before us of Col. i. 15, 16, which contains that remarkable expression, "The first-born of every creature." We give the second article of the Creed, as it stands in the Creed of the Constitutions, placing underneath the corresponding words of St. Paul:—

APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

"And in the Lord Jesus Christ
His only-begotten Son,
The first-born of every creature,
Begotten before the worlds of the good pleasure of the Father,
(Not created)[u]
By Whom all things were made
That are in heaven and on earth,
Both visible and invisible."

---

[s] See an article on the subject in the *Christian Remembrancer*, No. 84.

[t] Cyril, Hieros. Catech., xv., § 27.

[u] The genuineness of this clause appears doubtful.

Digitized by Google

COLOSSIANS I. 15, 16.

"Who is the image of the invisible God,
The first-born of every creature,
Because in Him all things were created,
That are in heaven and that are on earth,
Visible and invisible, ...
All things have been created by Him and for Him."

The consentient use thus made of this passage is important, as exhibiting the sense in which it was understood till the course of the Arian controversy led some of the Fathers, whom Grotius and the Socinians have followed, to put a different construction upon it, and to explain "The first-born of every creature" of the incarnate Christ, and "Every creature" of the new creation.[v] It is true the language employed in these formularies did not go beyond that which Arians would have acquiesced in; but at all events it expressly affirmed our Lord's pre-existence, and represented Him as the Creator of the physical universe. The ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, however, and ὁμοούσιος were still wanting to place the Church's Confession beyond the reach of evasion. To these we are brought in the next chapter.

They were in truth the characteristic notes of the Creed of Nicæa, as distinguished from all previous Creeds. On other formulæ the Arians contrived to put a non-natural sense. These formed a *shibboleth*, which, unless they would be palpably insincere, they could not frame to utter. They signified that our blessed Lord is God in the truest and highest sense,—not only God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, but God as the Father is God, Light as the Father is light, very God as the Father is very God.

Dr. Swainson does not enter upon the history of the Nicene Council. With this he presumes his readers to be already sufficiently familiar. He contents himself with giving an account of the Arian teaching, partly in the words of Arius himself, partly in those of the Bishop of Alexandria, whose lot it was to move the Church against him.

The first draught of the Nicene Formulary was one of the Creeds referred to in the preceding chapter, the Creed of Eusebius, which was presented by him to the Council in the early part of its deliberations. Such at least Eusebius himself states to have been the case; and a comparison of the two formularies confirms the statement. This Creed, however, was not a Creed of Eusebius' own framing; but the authorized symbol (apparently) of his Church, the Church of Cæsarea. "It set forth the faith," he says, "according as he had himself received

[v] See Professor Lightfoot on Col. i. 15.

Digitized by Google

it from the Bishops who preceded him, both when he was being instructed as a catechumen, and when he was baptized."

There was much debate, it seems, in the Council; but the result was the Creed which we subjoin,—the original Nicene Creed. Eusebius gives it, in a letter which he wrote to his people of Cæsarea to justify himself in having acquiesced in the terms ἐκ τῆς οὐσιας and ὁμοούσιον.[w]

"(1) We believe in one God the Father Almighty,
Maker of all things visible and invisible:
(2) And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God,
Begotten of the Father, only begotten,
That is, of the substance of the Father (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας),
God of God,
Light of Light,
Very God of very God,
Begotten, not made,
Of one substance with the Father (ὁμοούσιον),
By whom all things were made, both the things in heaven and the things in earth;
(3) Who, for us men and for our salvation,
Came down and was incarnate,
Was made man;
(4) He suffered,
(5) And rose again the third day;
(6) He ascended into the heavens,
(7) He shall come to judge the quick and the dead:
(8) And in the Holy Ghost.

"But those who say, 'Once He was not,' or 'Before He was begotten He was not,' or 'He came into being from nothing,' or who assert that the Son of God is of 'another substance or essence,' or that He is 'created,' or 'changeable,' or 'alterable,' the Catholic and Apostolic Church of God anathematizes."

Both the Creed put forth by the Council, and the Creed of Eusebius, on which it was based, end with the eighth Article. Some have thought that the ancient Oriental Creeds as a rule ended here.[x] But that such was not the case, is plain from the circumstance that other Creeds, contemporaneous or nearly so, contain the remaining Articles. The fact is, that there being no controversy on the subjects of those Articles, the Fathers left them as they found them. In St. Jerome's words, "Confessi sunt quod negabatur, tacuerunt de quo nemo quærebat.[y]

---

[w] Socrates, 1—8.

[x] So Archbishop Ussher at one time: "De Symb. Works," vol. vii., p. 316. See also Bishop Bull: "Judic. Eccles. Cath. Works," vol. vi., p. 132.

[y] Jerome, Epis. ad Pam. et Ocean.

Digitized by Google

Dr. Swainson (p. 68), with the obvious view of sustaining his favourite distinction between a "Rule of Faith" and a Creed, remarks that the Nicene Creed was intended at first to be a "Rule of Faith," not a "Symbol to be used by the newly baptized, or to be proposed to them."

Whatever the intention however of the Council, it was not long before it both came to be designated as a "Symbol," and to be used at baptism. In the East, as a Baptismal Creed, it gradually supplanted the Creeds of particular Churches, and by the middle of the fifth century it would seem to have been almost universally adopted, either in its original form, or in the enlarged edition of it which now bears its name. In the West, the local Creeds still held their own, though yet for some ages we have many examples of the use of both formularies.[z]

In the interval between A.D. 325 and 381, several Confessions of Faith were put forth by the Arians, with a view to supplant the Creed of Nicæa. These, among many differences, agreed at least in this, that they rejected the ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and the ὁμοούσιον. Dr. Swainson contents himself with simply referring to these, and then passes on (ch. viii.) to the additions which were made to the Nicene Formulary in order to guard against the Apollinarian and Macedonian heresies, and which appear in the two Creeds preserved by Epiphanius and in the Constantinopolitan Creed. We shall confine ourselves to the last mentioned.

The Apollinarians, orthodox as regards our Lord's Deity, denied the verity of His human nature in two respects. They held that His body was not derived from the Virgin, but was brought down from heaven. Moreover, distinguishing between the animal soul—the principle of life—and the rational, they believed the latter to be supplied by the Divine nature, which was to our Lord's body what the rational soul is to our bodies. It was in reference, then, to the former of these errors, that between the words of the Nicene Creed, "was incarnate" and "was made man," the Constantinopolitan inserted, "of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary."[a] The latter is not touched in the Constantinopolitan Creed, but it is pointedly guarded against in the longer of the two Creeds given by Epiphanius.

In the Constantinopolitan again, with an eye to the Macedonian heresy, which denied the proper Deity of the Holy Ghost, there was added to the simple clause "And in the Holy Ghost" of the Nicene formulary, "The Lord, the Giver of life (τὸ Κύριον,

[z] See the Benedictine Editor's note appended to the fifth of St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Catecheses.

[a] ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου. Our English reading is, "By the Holy Ghost, *of* the Virgin Mary."

Digitized by Google

τὸ ζωοποιόν), who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets;" and then followed the ninth and following Articles, which the Nicene Creed had omitted.

Dr. Swainson questions the opinion, almost universally received until lately (p. 93), that the Constantinopolitan Creed had the sanction of the Council from which it has borrowed its name. We cannot say that his reasons satisfy us. He urges (1) that it is unlikely that the Council would have omitted the ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός "within eight years of the death of Athanasius, and at a time when they declared their resolve to maintain his faith." The answer to which is that all that was meant by the words omitted was still retained in the ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, combined with Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ;—(2) that in a letter written from Constantinople the year following that of the Council, by another gathering of Bishops, reference is made to a "Tome" which had been put out the preceding year "by the Œcumenical Synod that met there, in which, as they say, they confessed the faith at greater length, and had framed in writing an anathematism of the heresies which had been recently innovated." (P. 91.) There is nothing in the Creed, however, inconsistent with this account. It would appear to have formed but a part of the "Tome;" and sufficient margin is left therefore for the fuller statement, as well as for the anathematism referred to.[b] In a subsequent chapter (ch. x.), in his account of the Eutychian controversy, Dr. Swainson returns to the subject, dealing with it on the historical ground of the opposition offered to the Creed by Eutyches and the Egyptian Bishops at the Council of Chalcedon. But it is to be remembered that that opposition was based solely on the Canon of Ephesus, which forbade the making of any other exposition of the faith than that which was made at Nicæa. (Pp. 119, 120.) There was not one word in the way of denying the sanction given by the Constantinopolitan Fathers, although the Creed was appealed to again and again as their's,—"the faith which the 150 Fathers (that is, who composed the Council of Constantinople) set out, agreeing with the holy and grand Synod of Nicæa." (P. 121.) It was a strange oversight on their part to leave out an argument of so much weight, if they could have availed themselves of it, as that no such sanction had ever before been heard of.

Whether however the Creed was put forth under the authority of the Council of Constantinople or otherwise is of little moment. It is sufficient that, together with and equally with the Creed of Nicæa, it had the deliberate and express sanction of the General

[b] So Tillemont, vol. ix., p. 494.

Digitized by Google

Council of Chalcedon, and of succeeding General Councils; and what is even of more account, that it has been accepted from that time forward by the Universal Church. It has indeed superseded the Nicene formulary in its office, and has even usurped its name, as though it were, what the Chalcedon Fathers described it, simply the original Creed explained and enlarged.[c]

How long the Constantinopolitan Creed has borne the name of the Nicene, it is not easy to say. Vossius[d] thought that even as early as the Council of Ephesus the two Creeds were regarded as one, and that as such both were contemplated in its Canon, which forbade the putting forth of any other Creed than that of the 318 Fathers (for by this designation the Nicene Creed was very commonly described, in like manner as the Constantinopolitan was by that of the 150,—the 150 Fathers who met at Constantinople). It is observable, at any rate, that Epiphanius, seven or eight years before the Council of Constantinople, in recording a Creed which is as nearly as possible identical with the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed, speaks of it as the Creed "delivered in the Church, the holy city, by all the holy Bishops, more than 310 in number,"[e]—the very title, though somewhat loosely worded, by which the Creed of Nicæa was ordinarily designated.

Theodorus Lector, speaking of the first introduction of the Creed into the Liturgy at Constantinople, says that it was due to Timotheus, the Archbishop of that See, who ordered the Creed to be used "at every assembly of the Church, by way of casting a reflection upon Macedonius, as though Macedonius did not receive the Creed, which formerly was rehearsed only once a year, on the holy eve of our Lord's passion, when the Bishop catechized."[f] It is not obvious on what ground Macedonius could be represented as having been ill-affected to either the Nicene or the Constantinopolitan Creed; but if one was meant rather than the other, it would seem to have been the Constantinopolitan. Yet the designation which Theodorus uses is the "Creed of the 318."

Archbishop Ussher, strangely enough, seems to have understood Theodorus to have meant, by Macedonius, the heretic of that name, to whom of course the doctrine of the Constantinopolitan Creed respecting the Holy Spirit was necessarily

---

[c] "Not as though superadding anything that had been omitted by their predecessors, but plainly stating in written testimony their own conception concerning the Holy Ghost, against those who were endeavouring to set aside His Sovereignty."—"Definitio Fidei Concil. Chalced."

[d] "De Tribus Symbolis, Diss. Tertia," § v.

[e] "Ancor.," § 120.

[f] Theod. Lect. Ecl., lib. ii.

Digitized by Google

repugnant.[g] But this is inconsistent with the history. The Macedonius referred to must have been the immediate predecessor of Timotheus, whose memory was so hateful to him that if he happened to find a statue or other representation of him in a church in which he was going to officiate, he would not proceed with the service till it had been removed.

The mention of Timotheus naturally suggests the topic to which the order of Dr. Swainson's work now brings us,—the Liturgical use of the Nicene Creed; and by the "Nicene," he tells us, we are henceforward to understand him to mean the Constantinopolitan. He gives the usual account, namely, that the Creed had no place in the public services of the Church, till towards the end of the fifth century, when Peter Fullo introduced it into the Liturgy of Antioch, of which he was Patriarch from 450 to 488. Peter's example was followed, as we have seen, at Constantinople, by Timotheus, who succeeded Macedonius in that See in 511; and by the end of the sixth century, the Creed would appear to have come into general use in the East. In the West, our first notice of its introduction is that King Recared, at the third Council of Toledo, in 589, directed that "the Creed of the 150" (the Constantinopolitan) should be recited in the Liturgy, before the Lord's Prayer, according to the form of the Oriental Churches, throughout all the Churches of Spain and Gallicia. From Spain the custom found its way into France, where in the time of Charlemagne the Constantinopolitan Creed was sung in the Royal Chapel. At Rome, however, it was not till 1014 that it was admitted into the service, and then not without reluctance. The Roman Church, "not being able to bring over the French and Spanish Churches to her own way, resolved at last to comply with their custom, that there might be no disagreement among them, and so the Nicene Creed came to be universally read throughout the whole Church."[h]

One point yet remains in connection with the Nicene Creed, or, to speak strictly, the Constantinopolitan: the history of the interpolations which the Western Church has introduced into it.

At some time or other, though the precise time is unknown, the words "God of God" have been added in the second Article; at another period, the words "and the Son" have been introduced into the clause regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit. The former Dr. Swainson supposes to have been "added in error, the memory of the scribe having been affected by his memory of the Nicene Creed." Whether in error, however, or

---

[g] Ussher de Symb. Works, vol. vii., p. 314.

[h] Bingham, x. 4, § 17.

Digitized by Google

of design, the addition (which in fact was simply the restoration of a clause which had had place in the original Creed of Nicæa) was of no doctrinal importance. The "God of God" being contained in "very God of very God," the Creed expressed neither more nor less than it had done before.

It was otherwise, however, with the addition, "and the Son" ("Filioque"). The insertion of those apparently simple words has resulted in consequences most disastrous to Christendom. The date of their insertion is involved in obscurity; but there can be little doubt that they were first added in Spain, and at the third Council of Toledo, A.D. 589. Earlier dates, indeed, have been assigned; but though Confessions of Faith containing the words have been cited,—one attributed to the first Council of Braga, A.D. 411, another to a Gallician Council, A.D. 447 or 448,—neither of these is the Constantinopolitan formulary. It should be mentioned, however, that even in the Constantinopolitan Creed which is given in the Acts of the third Council of Toledo, it is not certain that the reading "Filioque" is genuine. The Madrid Editor of 1593, notes it in his margin as of questionable authority.[1] Yet when it is considered that one of the twenty-three anathemas framed by the Council was pronounced on "whosoever does not believe, or has not believed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son," and that subsequent Councils of Toledo (A.D. 633, 681) recited the Creed "as they had received it," with the words inserted, their genuineness in the Creed of the third Council will hardly be doubted. (P. 147.)

From Spain the interpolated Creed soon made its way to France, England, and Germany. But it was long before it was adopted at Rome. Charlemagne, with whom the doctrine of the "Filioque" was of cardinal importance, was urgent with the Pope, Leo III., that he would sanction the interpolation, and two prelates were sent to him in 809, from a Synod summoned by Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, to obtain his approval. But Leo, though he acknowledged the doctrine, strenuously resisted what he regarded as an unlawful tampering with the Creed; and as a public declaration of his adherence to the symbol in its original form, he caused it to be engraved unaltered, in Greek and Latin, on two silver shields or tablets, and to be hung up in the Church of St. Peter.

"The successors of Charlemagne (to continue the history in Dr. Swainson's words) were as obstinate as their ancestor, whilst in the Church of Rome, Leo IV. and Benedict III. (both between 847—858) directed that the Creed should be recited in

[1] See Neale's "History of the Holy Eastern Church," vol. ii., p. 1152.

Digitized by Google

Greek, to maintain its genuine character. But the Spanish form was still spreading. It was of no avail that John VIII. condemned the addition in 879, or that in the spring of the succeeding year his Legate approved the act of the Synod of Constantinople, which reaffirmed the Creeds of the 318 and the 150, and rejected all interpolations.... At length the Teutonic Churches overcame the Church of Rome, and the Emperor Henry persuaded Benedict VIII. to use the Creed at the Mass; and he must have used it in the Spanish or German form; for about the same year 1014, the oath taken by the Pope on his election, appears to have been altered. Up to that time, each Pope had sworn to preserve unmutilated the decrees of the first five Councils, and the sixth as well; but in the eleventh century the oath was altered, and thus in all the Churches of the West the addition was accepted."[j]

"And so," says Bishop Pearson, "the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words, *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ*, or 'Filioque,' are taken out of the Creed. The one relying upon the truth of the doctrine as contained in the words, and the authority of the Pope to alter anything; the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for the authority of the ancient Councils. This, therefore, is much to be lamented,—that the Greeks should not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their ancestors, in the substance of it; and that the Latins should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed without as great an authority as hath prohibited it, and to use that language in the expression of this doctrine which never was used by any of the Greek Fathers."[k]

We here close the history of the Eastern Creed. That of the Western (the so-called Apostles' Creed) occupies the three following chapters (xiii.—xv.). This Creed, though often spoken of as the Roman Creed, was in no wise peculiar to the Church of Rome. With some trifling variations, it was the Creed of the Western Churches generally. We have examples of it at Aquileia, at Ravenna, at Turin, at Milan, in Africa, in Spain, in Gaul.

Dr. Swainson remarks that the term "Symbolum Apostolicum," or "Apostolorum," was not originally appropriated peculiarly to our present Apostles' Creed, and he cautions us that "when we meet with this title in the first ten centuries," we must not assume that the symbol meant is necessarily what we should now understand by it. Originally "Symbolum Apostolicum," or "Apostolorum," was the designation, not of one form of the Creed in particular, but of the Creeds generally, implying that the truths contained in them, if not couched in the very words delivered by the Apostles, were at the least Apostolic, such as the Apostles

---

[j] P. 151. [k] Pearson on the Creed. Note to Art. viii.

Digitized by Google

had taught and handed down. They were all, in fact, regarded as one and the same Creed, though varied in the manner of expression in different Churches; but when distinctive names came to be appropriated to other forms, "Symbolum Nicænum," "Constantinopolitanum," etc., then this form which had hitherto had no distinctive name, retained the appellation which originally had been common to all, and which thus at length became itself distinctive.

The history of the Apostles' Creed differs essentially from the history of the Nicene. Of the latter we can trace the growth: the growth of the former has been silent, and without observation. "The persons or authorities by whom the several additions were inserted, are unknown to us; the document was never discussed by a General Council." It was left to the custody of the several Churches, and each Church seems to have felt itself at liberty to make additions or alterations where occasion required.

Although we have traces of the Western formulary more or less exact in the writings of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, yet the earliest document which has come down to us, which may be supposed to represent the Creed expressed in the precise terms and completeness of its day, belongs to the middle of the fourth century. This is the document which Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, who lay under suspicion of heresy, presented to Julius, Bishop of Rome, in proof of the soundness of his faith, in A.D. 341.

Dr. Swainson is of opinion (p. 157) that "this document is really a composition by Marcellus; that he brought his Oriental knowledge to bear on the Western modes of thought, and arranged the floating beliefs of the West, the chief contents of their various Rules of Faith, after the fashion of the Nicene Creed;" and that the document thus framed was adopted by the Churches of Aquileia and Rome in the time of Rufinus, and by the Churches of Hippo in the time of Augustine.

Nothing, surely, can be more improbable than this hypothesis. The Churches which he mentions had not then to frame their symbol for the first time; and if they had been disposed to remodel the symbol which they already had, they would have been little likely to adopt as their model the "composition" of a man notoriously tainted with heresy.

Marcellus' Creed was undoubtedly either the Creed of his own Church (a supposition to which his assertion that he "had been taught it by his predecessors in God," gives countenance), or the Creed of the Roman Church, whose Bishop he wished to conciliate. Against the former supposition lies the consideration that in its structure it lacks the usual characteristics of the

Digitized by Google

Eastern Creeds; in favour of the latter, that it is, with only one exception worth notice, identical with the Roman Creed, such as we collect it from Rufinus some fifty years later; the exception being, that it contains the last Article, "Vitam Æternam," which the Roman Creed does not.

This Roman Creed, though by no means, as we have said, the exclusive property of Rome, may be regarded as the normal type of the Western symbol, from the middle of the fourth century to the close of the fifth. We meet, it is true, with occasional slight variations, and in the instance of the Aquileian Creed, with some of importance; but the words or clauses "Creatorem cæli et terræ" in Art. i., "Conceptus" in Art. iii., "Passus" and "Mortuus" in Art. iv., "Dei Omnipotentis" in Art. vi., "Catholicam" and "Sanctorum Communionem" in Art. ix., and "Vitam Æternam" in Art. xii., as well as, with one exception, "Descendit ad Inferna," or "Ad Inferos," in Art. v., belong most of them to a later date. Indeed, no example appears to be known of a Creed complete as in the present day, belonging to a date earlier than the middle of the eighth century; and even after that date, not a few instances of incomplete, or varying Creeds, are still met with.

Dr. Swainson traces these additions, as a rule, to Gaul. We give, in his own words, the "general result" at which he arrives, after an exhaustive inquiry, pursued throughout a chapter which contains the texts of several interesting Creeds together with references to a great number of others:—

"The complete copy of the Apostles' Creed, as it exists in the present day, was Frank. The separate Articles which distinguish it from the old Roman, Aquileian, African, Spanish, English, Scotch, and Irish types, are all of Gallican origin. They came through or from Faustus of Riez and the old Gallican service books to Pirminius, the Frank Missionary of the eighth century, and the completed Creed gradually spread from that time, the vehicle by which it was circulated being furnished by the Psalters which were written in abundance in and after the time of Charlemagne." (P. 170.) "To this source Rome herself, it would appear, is indebted for the completed text of that formulary which it has been the custom to designate as distinctively the Roman Creed." (See note at p. 171.)

It may be well, before we pass on, to exhibit the Apostles' Creed in the form in which, with some variations of more or less

---

[1] "The schools of Charlemagne and Alcuin wrought a revolution in the literary, no less than in the theological world; and it is gratifying to find at the present day, so many exquisite specimens of calligraphy, assigned by experts to the period of, or immediately succeeding to the lifetime of Charlemagne." (P. 190.)

Digitized by Google

importance, it appears to have been used during the fourth and fifth centuries. The following is the Roman text, as indicated by Rufinus, about A.D. 390. There are sufficient notices in the Epistles of Pope Leo the Great, to show that it had undergone no alteration of consequence some sixty years later.[m] As the Articles of the Creed were by this time commonly ascribed each to a several Apostle, the number twelve must have been made out by a different division from that now commonly used.[n]

"(1) Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem;
(2) Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum,
(3) Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto Ex Maria Virgine,
(4) Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato Et sepultus,
(5) Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis,
(6) Ascendit in cælos,
(7) Sedet ad dexteram Patris,
(8) Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos;
(9) Et in Spiritum Sanctum;
(10) Sanctam Ecclesiam;
(11) Remissionem peccatorum;
(12) Carnis resurrectionem."

We add an Interrogatory Baptismal Creed of the Church of Rome, of about A.D. 495, from the Gelasian Sacramentary. The correspondence between the two formularies should be noted:—

"Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem?
Credo.
Credis et in Jesum Christum, Filium Ejus unicum,
Dominum nostrum,
Natum
Et passum?
Credo.
Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum;
Sanctam ecclesiam;
Remissionem peccatorum;
Carnis resurrectionem?
Credo."

"Natum et passum" was a frequent compendium in Interrogatory Creeds for all the Articles between the second and the eighth. We do not remember to have met with it in any Declarative Creed. Want of attention to the distinction between

[m] See a letter in the *Guardian*, dated Feb. 22nd, 1872, on "The Roman Creed of the fourth and fifth Centuries."

[n] Ibid.

Digitized by Google

the two classes of Creeds has led a recent writer to affirm that the Roman Creed of the fourth and fifth centuries was simply the preceding Interrogatory Creed put into a Declaratory form.[o]

It only remains to speak of the use of the Apostles' Creed in the Church's services. Its earliest use was in the preparation for baptism, to which circumstance Dr. Swainson traces the word "Symbolum," as applied to the Creed, though the word belongs in no wise peculiarly to the Apostles' Creed. Baptism was the rite of initiation into the Christian mysteries, and the Creed which in preparation for baptism the candidates were taught, and which at baptism they were required to profess, was "the formula of initiation."

Great care was taken in the earlier Church, while it was yet surrounded by a heathen population, to conceal the Creed from those without. St. Cyril cautions his hearers, whom he is instructing, now on the eve of baptism, to be on their guard lest any even of the catechumens should overhear them, when saying it over to themselves. It was not permitted to commit it to writing. "No one writes the Creed that it may be read," says Augustine, in one of his sermons. "Let your memory be your book, so that forgetfulness may not efface what diligence hath taught."[p] And Sozomen assigns as his reason for not giving the Nicene Creed a place in his history, that his friends dissuaded him, lest it should get into the hands of unbelievers.[q]

We have no certain record of the time when the Apostles' Creed first came into use in the Church's worship; but Mr. Ffoulkes, to whom Dr. Swainson refers (p. 177), gives reasons for assigning its introduction to the year 816, at which date we find a Synod held at Aix, enjoining the repetition at Prime of the "Pater Noster" and the "Credo in Deum," in secret, at the end of the Lection, and after "Kyrie Eleison," thrice said.[r] The rule that it should be said in secret, "under breath," still holds, it appears, in the Roman Church.[s]

"In the English Church, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer always followed the Psalms in the Nocturnal Office or Matins. The two were used also almost daily in the body of the English services at Prime. Hence the Creed passed, at the revision of 1549, into our Reformed Service-book, being then 'said by the minister with a loud voice, all devoutly kneeling.' The modern order, that the Creed should be 'said by the minister and people standing,' dates from 1552, the direction that it should be omitted 'when the Creed of St. Athanasius is appointed to be said,' from 1662." (P. 190.)

---

[o] See the letter in the *Guardian*, above referred to.

[p] "De Symb. ad Catechumenos," § i. [q] Sozom., i. 20.

[r] Ffoulkes on the Athanasian Creed, pp. 184—187. [s] Ibid, p. 188.

Digitized by Google

Whatever may have been the date of the first introduction of the Creed into the public service of the Church, great importance, from a very early date, was attached to the learning of it by individuals, and the habitual repetition of it in private. "Hear and receive the Rule of Faith, which is called the Creed," says St. Augustine, in a sermon already referred to; "and when you have received it, write it in your hearts, and say it to yourselves daily. Before you go to sleep, before you go out, arm yourselves with your Creed."[t] The requirement of a knowledge of it, often enforced by stringent penalties in case of ignorance, is of frequent occurrence in the canons of the middle ages. No one was allowed to stand sponsor at baptism, unless he could say by heart the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. By a law of Canute, if a person would not learn these he was to be deprived of the Eucharist; and by a law of King Edgar, one who had not known them was to be refused burial in consecrated ground.[u]

There was the more reason for such rules in an age of great and almost universal lack of book-learning, when in fact men's memories were their only books; but the Church of England still shows the importance which she attaches to an acquaintance, on the part of every individual of her members, with the very letter of the Creed, by her directions to sponsors that "chiefly they shall provide" that their Godchildren "may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue," and by her order in regard to candidates for confirmation, that none shall be confirmed but such as can repeat the same.

We have now followed Dr. Swainson through the first and second portions of his learned and valuable work. Our aim has been to give the substance of the great mass of materials which he has brought together, so as to place before our readers a succinct view of the history of the formularies of which he treats. Where we have been constrained to differ from him, we have not hesitated to exhibit our own view; sometimes simply and without remark, at others pointing out the discrepancy, and assigning the grounds of our opinion. We take leave of him for the present, hoping in a future article to follow him in his investigation into the history of the Athanasian Creed, in the remaining portion of his book; but we cannot close our remarks without again expressing our sense of the value of the contribution which he has made, at the cost of much labour and much research, to the interesting and important subject which he has taken in hand.

---

[t] "De. Symb. ad. Catech.," § i.

[u] See Appendix to ch. xv., pp. 192—194.

Digitized by Google

THE HOLY BIBLE.

The Holy Bible, according to the Authorized Version (*A.D.* 1611) *with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter; Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Vol. V. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations. John Murray.* 1875.

AFTER a considerable interval another volume of this great and responsible work has appeared. It contains Dr. Kay's Introduction to the Prophecies of Isaiah, together with his Commentary and Critical Notes upon that Book; and Dean Payne Smith's Introductions to the Prophecies of Jeremiah, and the Lamentations, together with his Commentaries and Critical Notes upon those Books.

We propose to direct the attention of our readers, on the present occasion, to the former of these contributions, not in consideration of the merits or the defects of the respective writers, but solely in regard to the limits within which our present notice of this volume must be confined, and the important issues of the great conflict which is now being waged over the authorship of writings which the Jewish and the Christian Church have uniformly assigned to the pen of the prophet Isaiah.

In the opening portion of his Introduction Dr. Kay directs attention to the larger space which is covered in the Hebrew Bible than in our own by the general title "Prophets:" a title which, as is well-known to Hebrew students, includes under the designation of the "former Prophets," the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and, under that of "the later Prophets," the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve shorter Books, commonly known as "the minor Prophets." This combination, our author observes, sets forth "the entire issue of the Sinaitic Covenant;" the former cycle exhibiting the Law as "unable to bring in an epoch of righteousness," the latter cycle pointing to a time when the "Law shall be transfigured and glorified, and its interior purpose be realized before all nations."

Amongst the prophetical books, properly so called, the writings of the Prophet Isaiah, although chronologically later than those of four at least of the minor prophets, justly occupy in the Hebrew, as in the English Bibles, the foremost place, not only as "ranging over the whole field of prophetic vision," but also in regard to "the breadth and grandeur" of the vision therein disclosed.

We altogether agree with Dr. Kay, that in order to understand aright the meaning of the Prophets it is absolutely essential

Digitized by Google

that we should attain to a clear idea of the one ruling purpose which pervades the whole of them. Dr. Kay elucidates this purpose by reference to the prophecies of Jonah, the earliest, as it should appear, of the whole collection. "Israel's vocation," he says, "was to be an intermediary agent, through which the grace of God should be diffused over the world." Jonah's mission to the Ninevites, as recorded in the Book which bears his name, shows that if Israel should refuse to execute the appointed work, God was yet able to work by them, as reluctant agents, in the accomplishment of His own purposes. The record of the results of Jonah's mission is full of instruction. The repentance of the Ninevites was a typical representation of the ingathering of the other sheep which were not included in the Jewish fold. The suspended doom of Nineveh was fraught with signal lessons to Israel. If the Ninevites were spared on their repentance, God was doubtless willing to spare Israel also. If Israel was bent on perseverance in apostacy, the men of Nineveh would rise up in the judgment to condemn them.

If such be a correct view of the purpose which pervades the whole of the prophetic Books, then it follows, as Dr. Kay unanswerably urges, that those who are "held in the chains of *naturalistic* speculation" are altogether disqualified for a true exposition of these writings.

Now it is notorious that there is no canon of Rationalistic exegesis which is more generally received, or more strenuously defended, than is the assumption that it is altogether inconceivable that God should communicate to man any foreknowledge of future events. In the interpretation of the prophetical Books of Scripture, the results of this baseless assumption affect, in two ways, the conclusions of the negative school of criticism. In regard to those passages which are *capable* of a double interpretation, that interpretation, however forced and unnatural, is often assigned to them in accordance with which they can be regarded either as declarations respecting the present, or as shrewd anticipations of the nearly impending future. In regard to those passages which absolutely exclude such interpretation, no alternative remains but to dispute the date of their composition.

It is almost needless to say that the prophecies of Isaiah afford one of the most crucial tests of the correctness or incorrectness of this canon of interpretation. Hence it is that they have suffered from the application of two methods of evasion. Some of the confessedly genuine prophecies have been distorted in a most unnatural manner, in order to eliminate from them the distinctly predictive element; whilst, in regard to those which are absolutely incapable of being so handled, they have been ascribed

Digitized by Google

to a later writer, or writers, to whom,—as the last resource of a criticism which has found itself hopelessly at fault,—the name of the "Great Unnamed," or the "Great Unkown," or the "Unnamed," or "Unknown," has been assigned.

The various theories which have been successively adopted and abandoned respecting the time and the place at which this "Great Unknown," or the "Unknown" prophets composed the writings thus ascribed to him, or to them, and the sources from whence he, or they, derived the contents of some of the earlier chapters, and the whole or the greater portion of the later chapters of this wonderful Book, have been carefully and, as we think, successfully encountered and demolished, both by Continental and by English theologians. Amongst the former we may refer more particularly to Drechsler, Keil, and Delitzsch, and amongst the latter to Dean Payne Smith, and to Professors Birks and Stanley Leathes.

But, however ably and fully this subject had been already treated, it cannot be denied that there was yet room for a vindication of the unity of authorship of Isaiah's prophecies, such as that for which we are indebted to the pen of Dr. Kay; a vindication to which, if we do not greatly deceive ourselves, the upholders of a Babylonian, or an Egyptian Isaiah, will find it no easy matter to produce a satisfactory reply.

Having first cleared the ground by showing that the assumption of the negative school of critics in regard to prophecy generally is neither an axiomatic truth, nor a proposition which can be established by deductive or inductive reasoning, Dr. Kay brings his vigorous intellect and his ripe stores of learning to bear on the question of the unity of authorship of the prophecies which the Jewish and the Christian Church agree in ascribing to Isaiah.

In regard to the external evidence, it will suffice to observe (1), that for the space of 2,400 years from the date of Isaiah's death, the acute but sceptical Jewish scholar Ibn Ezra is the only person who is known to have expressed a doubt about the authorship of these writings; and (2) that the disputed portions of these prophecies are frequently quoted by the writers of the New Testament as Isaiah's. (St. Matt. iii. 3; xii. 17, etc.)

Thus far the maintainers of the genuineness of the prophecies commonly ascribed to Isaiah, stand on vantage ground. But this is not all. Not content with the general answers to the antecedent objections to prophecy which have been already noticed, Dr. Kay proceeds to a direct assault upon the enemy's camp, by showing that in the case of those prophecies of Isaiah the genuineness of which is universally allowed, there are distinct and unequivocal predictions of future events which actually

Digitized by Google

received their fulfilment. It will suffice to refer, by way of illustration, to the predictions contained in the earlier chapters, and fulfilled after an interval of about thirty years, respecting the hostile invasion of the Assyrians, the contemplated and threatened destruction of Jerusalem, and the scourge prepared for the humiliation of the haughty invaders. (Is. viii. 7, 8; x. 5—34.)

Having thus successfully, as we think, demolished both generally and specifically the antecedent objection to prophecy, that a genuine prediction of any future event, based upon Divine revelation, is altogether inconceivable, Dr. Kay not only insists with becoming earnestness upon the incontrovertible facts that the writer of chapters xli.—xlviii., whoever he may have been, does unquestionably profess to reveal, in God's name, things to come, and that he designs to establish, by this proof, the superiority of Jehovah over all idol-gods, but he appeals to the predictions contained in those chapters as supplying Cyrus with the only sufficient motive, as far as we can see, to liberate the captive Jews; and he observes that the fulfilment of those predictions, after the lapse of 170 years, appears to have supplied the restored exiles not only with the strongest, but with the only efficient motive against a relapse into their former idolatry.

Dr. Kay appeals, yet further, to the great prophecy contained in Is. lii. 13, liii., whatever the date of its composition (and, we may add, whatever the nature of its alleged accomplishment in the person of Jeremiah, or of some unknown martyr-prophet, according to Bunsen and Ewald, or in the collective people of Israel, or its godly portion, according to other late interpreters), as having received its unique realization in the Person and work of "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Having thus not only removed the antecedent objections to prophecy generally, but also shown that the prophecies of Isaiah (both those which are confessedly genuine, and those which are alleged to be spurious) contain predictions which have actually received their accomplishment, Dr. Kay proceeds to combat, and in our judgment to demolish the objections which have been urged against the second part of those prophecies, on the ground of *literary criticism.*

I. It has been alleged, that as the result of a comparison of the later prophecies of Isaiah with those portions of the earlier prophecies, the genuineness of which is allowed, we discover a considerable amount of diversity both of style and of language.

Before our author proceeds to consider the specific allegations of those critics who have employed this argument against the genuineness of the later portion of Isaiah's prophecies, he very properly directs the attention of his readers to two preliminary

Digitized by Google

considerations, which go far towards evacuating the force of any arguments which rest upon this basis.

(1) He appeals to the confession of the negative critics themselves, as to the great amount of *resemblance* which exists between chapters xl.—lxvi., and the acknowledged writings of Isaiah; a confession which reduces the force of the hostile argument to the consideration whether the real or alleged differences outweigh the admitted resemblance, or are outweighed by it.

(2) With a view to aid his readers in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion on this point, Dr. Kay reminds them that no author is perpetually restricted within the same cycle of thoughts or of words, more especially when not only his subject-matter is changed, but when also the time and the circumstances under which he writes are changed also. "No one," he observes, "thinks of denying the 'Persæ' to Æschylus, because in form and method of treatment it is strongly contrasted with the 'Prometheus' or the 'Suppliants.'" And yet further, Dr. Kay rightly directs attention to the fact that the more an author is distinguished by originality, depth, and strength,—in other words, the more decisive the indications which his writings afford of "genius,"—the less possible it becomes to conjecture what will be the distinctive characteristics of the treatment which any fresh subject, or which any new phase of an old subject, will receive at his hands.

Dr. Kay examines at some length the alleged *literary evidence* of a diversity of authorship in the prophecies commonly ascribed to Isaiah, which Knobel (who has the reputation of being one of the most able, and who is unquestionably one of the most persevering of the negative critics) has collected or discovered.

We should far exceed the limits of the present review, were we to enter at any length upon this portion of Dr. Kay's valuable Introduction. Moreover, it is one which requires, in order to its full appreciation, a certain amount of acquaintance with Hebrew, a pre-requisite which it would be unreasonable to expect on the part of the ordinary English reader, and which, alas! does not always form a part of the education of those whose special office it is to expound that Book, the greater portion of which was written in the Hebrew tongue.

We must content ourselves, therefore, as regards this part of Dr. Kay's Introduction, with presenting our readers with a very imperfect sketch of the nature of the answers which he returns to Knobel's objections.

I. Dr. Kay shows that as regards some of the words which occur frequently in the second part of Isaiah, in a participial form, and which Knobel affirms do not occur at all in the first part, (i.) that the same words are found as verbs in the first part,

Digitized by Google

which occur as participles in the second part; and (ii.) that there is such a manifest co-relation between the language of the two parts, not only generally, but also as regards some of those very words, that that which was alleged as an objection against the genuineness of the second part, serves rather as an argument in favour of the fundamental unity of the whole Book.

II. Whereas Knobel adduces several words which he alleges are used in part ii. in a sense altogether different from that in which they are found in part i., Dr. Kay shows that these very words are used in the same sense in both parts; in fact, that the alleged divergencies are found on examination to be exact parallelisms.

III. Knobel attaches much importance to the number of words which are peculiar to the second part of Isaiah, most of which occur only once. Dr. Kay, who has carefully counted up these words, finds that whereas in the first twelve chapters (the genuineness of which is admitted) there are seventy-seven words peculiar to Isaiah, and in the twelve confessedly genuine chapters between xiii. and xxxiii. there are eighty-one of these words, there are but seventy-nine of these peculiar words in the twenty-seven chapters which constitute part ii.; so that here, as in the case of some of the other objections which have been alleged, the fact adduced as an argument against the Isaianic origin of part ii. becomes one of the many arguments which may be urged in support of its genuineness.

It is well deserving of notice, however, in connection with this portion of his argument, that of the words which occur in no other Book of the Old Testament, several are found in part ii., as well as in part i. of the prophecies of Isaiah; thus affording another fair presumption, so far as literary evidence is concerned, of identity of authorship.

Not content, however, with demolishing the so-called critical objections of opponents, Dr. Kay urges with much force the extreme improbability that Isaiah, after sustaining for many years the faith of the Jews, and promising security to the house of David, should break off his work with the announcement of the captivity in Babylon, and never subsequently resume it. He then proceeds to adduce a few of the many links which bind together the two portions of these marvellous prophecies, the argumentative force of which he leaves to the consideration of his readers. A very few examples of these must suffice.

(1) In both portions of the prophecies a house is to be founded on the holy mountain of Jehovah, unto which all nations are to resort (ii. 2, 3; lvi. 7; lx. 12—14.)

(2) In both parts Israel is to be chastised and afflicted (i. 2—5; lxiii. 8—10); the people and the land are to be forsaken (vi. 12;

Digitized by Google

xlix. 14), and a remnant only is to be saved (iv. 3; lix. 20); but in both God Himself is to come and save them (xxxv. 4; xl. 10), and the everlasting covenant is to be established with them (ix. 7; lv. 3, 4).

(3) Again, whereas in iii. 26 Zion, in her desolation, is represented as *sitting upon the ground*, in lx. 1 she is summoned to *arise* and *shine*, seeing that her *light is come*, and that the *glory of Jehovah has risen upon her*.

(4) And, once more, whereas in lxiv. 4 we find the allusion to the good things which God has prepared for *him that waiteth for Him*, followed in the seventh verse by the words, "*Thou hast hid Thy face from us*," this combination receives its explanation when, on looking back to viii. 17, we find the words, "*And I will wait for the Lord, that hideth His face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for Him.*"

We have already dwelt so long upon the great question of the unity or diversity of authorship of Isaiah's prophecies, that we fear to exhaust the patience of our readers by protracting the discussion. Before, however, we pass on to notice very briefly the characteristics of the Commentary before us, we must pause for a few moments in order to enable our readers to realize the real nature of the alternative proposed for our reception.

On the one hand, we are presented with a mass of evidence, both external and internal, in favour of the genuineness of Isaiah's prophecies as a whole,—more copious, more complete, and more conclusive than that on which the authorship of many of the other prophetical books rests, and far exceeding that on which the authorship of any profane history of antiquity, as, *e.g.*, that of Herodotus, Thucydides, or Xenophon is universally accepted. On the other hand, we have been seriously assured by men, whose judgment on questions of a purely critical nature is entitled to every consideration, that we are indebted for a large portion of writings,—the most original, the most important, and the most clearly marked by distinctive peculiarities of authorship,—to some unknown prophet who lived in Babylon towards the close of the exile, of whose personal history we know absolutely nothing, and whose memory perished with him.

No sooner was this theory tested by a careful examination of the chapters, both in the first and in the second parts of the prophecies which were assigned to this *Babylonian* Isaiah, than the internal evidence against such a theory was found to be so overwhelming that it was abandoned by almost all critics whose names are entitled to consideration. Moreover, whatever the country assigned to the imaginary writer, it was found that difficulties almost equally insurmountable attended every theory which had been invented respecting the date of the composition.

Digitized by Google

Independently of the reasonable presumption that the later the date of the writing, the less probability existed that the name of so distinguished a prophet should be buried in perpetual oblivion,[a] another and a much greater difficulty remained to be encountered. If a date was accepted sufficiently early to entitle the disclosures made to be regarded as shrewd anticipations of the nearly impending future, then it was impossible to account for the minuteness and precision of some of the events foretold, without admitting the existence of the predictive element in prophecy. If, on the other hand, the apparent predictions *followed*, instead of *preceding*, the events, then it was absolutely impossible to account for the prophetic garb beneath which a history of the past was disguised as an announcement of the future. Under these circumstances Ewald's theory of a succession of "fly-leaves," however encompassed by difficulties, is perhaps the most *ingenious* of the proposed solutions of a problem which may fairly be affirmed to have altogether baffled the combined efforts of the negative critics. In a time of general oppression a number of prophets, belonging to the second generation of exiles, "contented themselves with sending into the world fly-sheets, so to speak, to which they did not think it worth while to put their names, and thus they soon called into existence once more a branch of composition which was shortly afterwards to die out altogether." The chief of these unknown prophets whom Ewald distinguishes as the "great Unnamed," or the "great Unknown," is supposed to have lived in Egypt towards the close of the Captivity.

Whilst, however, we freely admit the ingenuity of this proposed solution of the difficult problem with which the neo-critics have to deal, it seems superfluous to enlarge upon the insuperable difficulties with which such a theory is encompassed. We will only observe that, in our judgment, it fails to remove the specific difficulties which the modern school of critics finds in the admission of the genuineness of the prophecies of Isaiah.

Had the imaginary standing-place of the prophet been, as is commonly assumed, uniformly the same,—viz., the land of Judah at, or about, the period when the Edict of Cyrus was issued, then we admit that an unknown prophet, or succession of

[a] It is very important to observe the essential distinction in this respect between the historical and the prophetical books of the Old Testament. In the case of the former, the authorship was, comparatively speaking, a matter of little importance, and one, consequently, the memory of which might easily perish. In the latter case it was the personal claims of the prophet which determined the acceptance or the rejection of his message. In the case of writings of so important a character to the whole nation as those of the prophecies contained in chapters xl.—lxvi. of the Book of Isaiah there is an *a priori* improbability of a very strong nature against the supposition that the name of the writer should not have been ascertained, or that, when once known, it should have been afterwards forgotten.

Digitized by Google

prophets, living in Egypt, or even in Babylon, might have thrown himself or themselves, in imagination, into the scenes which they respectively describe, and might have composed graphic representations of events with which the political horizon was already darkened at the particular period at which each wrote.

But we submit that no satisfactory explanation is thus afforded of the actual facts with which we have to deal. For we have before us, in the earlier and later prophecies of Isaiah, not only a succession of predictions relating to the Assyrian invasion and the deliverance of Jerusalem,—of the might and dominion of Babylon, when as yet a dependency upon Assyria,—of the impending captivity of the Jews, and the destruction of the dominant power by a person specified by name, and, further, of the approaching deliverance from that Babylonian captivity, and the means by which that deliverance was to be accomplished, —but we have beyond all these, as Dr. Kay, in common with other orthodox expositors, has irrefutably established, predictions of the times of the Messiah so direct and explicit that every attempt which has been made to assign to them any other than the Messianic interpretation has only served to establish more decisively the utter impracticability of the task.

As regards the exposition of the prophecies of Isaiah, considered as a whole, we altogether agree with Dr. Kay, that they will be best understood when viewed in connection with the earlier books of the Old Testament, and with the frequent allusions made to them in the New Testament; and that it is only when the typical, the allegorical, and the spiritual, as well as the literal meaning of these prophecies is apprehended, that a real and comprehensive insight into their true design, and connection, can be attained. Those who read the prophecies of Isaiah as they read any work of profane literature, must inevitably fail to discern the true intent of a book which, if its predictive element be denied, deserves to be regarded in no other light than that of a deliberate attempt at imposture. None who are endowed with an average amount of intellectual sense can regard the writings of Isaiah as those of an ordinary enthusiast or fanatic. Whatever judgment may be pronounced by Rationalists upon the authors of other books included within the Jewish Canon, the writer of the prophecies commonly ascribed to Isaiah either wrote under the direct inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, which enabled him to foresee and to foretell things which were yet to come, or he must be regarded as one who laid claim to the possession of gifts of which he was consciously devoid, and to the reception of Divine communications, which were the inventions of his own imagination. Those who desire to arrive at

Digitized by Google

a right conclusion on this alternative, will do well to study, seriously and prayerfully, the key to the right understanding of these prophecies which Dr. Kay has supplied.

We have left ourselves little room to discuss the merits of Dr. Kay as a commentator. His distinctive characteristics appear to us to be profound learning, independent research, combined with due respect for ancient authorities; and above these, unfeigned reverence for every word which proceeds out of the mouth of God. If, at any time, we are constrained to demur to any of his conclusions, we feel that those conclusions are the result of patient and laborious investigation, and that they are not to be rejected without equally full and careful examination.

As a fair specimen of Dr. Kay's principles of exegesis we may refer to his exposition of the celebrated prophecy of Isaiah vii. 14. Having observed that the Hebrew words rendered "a Virgin," should be translated "*the* Virgin," and that the prophecy would be more correctly represented by the use of the present instead of the future, "Behold the Virgin is with child, and beareth a Son," Dr. Kay expresses his conviction that "no interpretation of this verse can be adequate, which does not satisfy the following conditions:—

"(1) It must yield a sense which is not unworthy of the grandeur of the offer made in v. 11; in other words, it must view the promised birth as supernatural.

"(2) The child must be born of David's family; for so only would the birth be fitted to guarantee the perpetuity of David's house (chap. ix. 7.)

"(3) The child must be such that the doctrine of God's presence with Israel (so long represented by the Shekinah) shall be realized in His person.

"(4) The dignity of the child must not fall short of that assigned to Him in the prophet's own expansion of the name 'Immanuel,' in ix. 6.

"These reasonable demands," Dr. Kay adds, "have never been met by any interpretation but that which the birth of Jesus supplied." (Matt. i., 22, 23; Luke i., 31, 35.)

One more illustration of Dr. Kay's exegesis must suffice. In a note, appended to chapter liii., our author having first adduced ample proof that the early Jewish authorities interpreted this remarkable prophecy of the Messiah, proceeds to refer to the twofold interpretation which has been adopted by those later writers who reject the Messianic interpretation.

Amongst those who explain the prophecy as referring to Jeremiah, Dr. Kay refers to R. Saadia Gaon, who was followed by Grotius, and by that amiable, and accomplished, but alas! untrustworthy scholar, the late Chevalier Bunsen. Dr. Kay

Digitized by Google

refers also to Abarbanel, who explains the prophecy of Josiah; and he justly observes that "the prophecy at large finds no reflexion in the history of either."

Dr. Kay then alludes to the interpretation of those critics who explain the prophecy, either as referring to Israel collectively, or to the godly portion of the people, or to the prophetic order. He remarks that the reference could not be to the people at large, inasmuch as they are uniformly represented by the prophets as suffering for their own sins, and not for those of others. Neither could the reference be to the prophets or righteous men, inasmuch as the notion that they could make expiation for the guilt of the nation is altogether opposed to the whole tenour of Scripture; and further, many parts of the chapter are incapable of application, either to the nation or to any body of men within it. "The nation collectively was not cut off from the land of the living. The prophets collectively had not their grave appointed with the wicked. The godly portion was never collectively 'numbered with the transgressors.'" Dr. Kay observes in conclusion, "All attempts to find any solution other than the historical one supplied in the Gospels are but instances of the blindness over which the prophet lamented in v. 1. 'Who hath believed our message?'"

In his notes on the prophecies of Isaiah, Dr. Kay has made no attempt to determine the question how far a literal restoration of Jerusalem is to be looked for, inasmuch as he does not see that Scripture supplies materials out of which a definite judgment on this point can be formed. At the same time he holds firmly to the belief, for which the Epistle to the Romans affords sufficient warrant, that "resuscitated Israel will in some signal way promote the spiritual well-being of the nations." Whilst disposed, for our own part, to advance somewhat beyond Dr. Kay's conclusions, and to hold an anticipation of the advance of Israel, as a nation, to some signal position of honour amongst the nations, as more than a probable "conjecture," we think that our author has erred on the safe side; and that, in regard to a subject the obscurities of which nothing but the event will altogether dissipate, it behoves the humble and thoughtful expositor of God's Word to proceed with extreme caution, and to avoid every attempt to be wise above what is written in the Book.

In conclusion, we cannot refrain from inviting those of our readers who are capable of following Dr. Kay in his critical investigation into the authorship of those chapters of Isaiah, between the xiii. and the xxxv., the genuineness of which has been impugned by the neo-critics, to study carefully the valuable Appendix B. which is attached to the Introduction.

Digitized by Google

It remains only that we express our grateful sense of obligation to Dr. Kay for a contribution to our Biblical literature, the value of which will, we believe, be increasingly felt and acknowledged by those who are competent to form an opinion of its merits, in proportion as it is carefully and impartially examined. We have already reached our appointed limits; and we should be guilty of injustice alike to the subject, and to the writer, were we to attempt to convey to our readers, within the compass of a few lines, any adequate conception of the estimate which we have formed of the merits or defects of the remaining portion of the 5th instalment of the "Speaker's Commentary." We shall hope, on a future occasion, to resume our examination of the contents of the important and interesting volume before us.

QUEEN MARY.

A Drama by Alfred Tennyson. H. S. King and Co. 1875.

THIS drama would not have made Mr. Tennyson Poet-Laureate, but any work of one who possesses in these later days that monopoly of public favour which fell to Pope in the earlier half of the eighteenth century, must not be passed by without notice. It is constructed on the principle of Shakspere's "Histories,"—we will not say in rivalry of the great poet, but certainly after his model, and plainly as prolonging the series which the elder poet broke off with Henry VIII., and broke off, doubtless, because it was worth a man's head then to travel over half-extinguished embers. The plan followed has been to versify contemporaneous records, where they exist, with as little deviation as possible, and to represent in a dramatic form the currents of passing opinion by embodying them in the language of the day. Shakspere, more particularly in his plays which deal with remoter events, has felt himself free to exercise his imagination, and thus we have come to accept much as history which has only his own fancy for authority. The thirty lines which describe Cardinal Beaufort's death have little but the most meagre foundation in Hall; and for other characters of still earlier plays (earlier as regards the events portrayed) Shakspere has felt still more at liberty to give the reins to his fancy. But his hand was checked when he came to deal with the events of his own or his father's days. He could only paint men as all about him knew them. He was fortunate in having a Wolsey to shadow forth, and he had little else to do than to versify the

Digitized by Google

records of the great Cardinal's magnificence and disgrace to give us some of the highest features of tragedy.

It is true indeed that the Poet-Laureate stands at a distance of three centuries from his subject, and we might ask why he does not draw as largely on his imagination in the present work as in much of the *Idylls of the King?* The answer is, that Mr. Tennyson had to deal with a period on which such vivid light has been thrown, that he could do little but cleave to the truth of history. He could not make Mary Tudor into a heroine, nor invest the great central figure of our Anglican Reformation with certain qualities which the world regards as indispensable for its heroes. But he has stricken a bold stroke on the right side, and many who cared little for Mr. Tennyson's other writings, or perhaps hardly appreciated them, do read, as we know, with zest and pleasure this picture of an age which did so much to make England what it is, and in reading they find their own impressions deepened and confirmed.

But it is for another reason that we turn to this striking sketch of the Marian period with special satisfaction. It is true that the strongly dramatic character of the Poet-Laureate's genius makes it difficult to gather from his works his own personal opinions. He is almost as objective as Shakspere. He becomes for the nonce the character he is painting. He is by turns the village maiden, the Egyptian hermit, the noble-hearted reformer of a corrupt society, the passionate artist, and a hundred others. He merges his own individuality in theirs, and is at the very opposite pole from Byron, whose morbid and selfish vanity betrays the individual through all his disguises, as he paints but from one model,—a clever profligate at war with himself. We might therefore be disposed at first to question whether Mr. Tennyson in his new drama which is so thoroughly dramatic, is painting an historical picture or giving us his own matured opinions. But on the whole we cannot help hoping that the latter is the case. We are struck, not only by his careful study and mastery of the controversy of the Reformation, showing us how he appreciates it; but, hardly without love and admiration for the *man*, could he have thrown such a lustre about Cranmer,—while not concealing his lack of moral courage,—nor have re-instated him in that central shrine of English affections, from which Macaulay and Froude have so ungenerously striven to depose him. He might easily have so depicted Queen Mary as the victim of circumstances, as to have drawn out our sympathies for her and the ancient faith. But though we commiserate her to the full, it is only to learn anew the solemn lesson how the sins of the father are visited on the children; while Popish bigotry, always unlovely, becomes tenfold unlovelier in the harsh and superstí-

Digitized by Google

tious peevishness it can stamp on a woman's nature. We cannot, therefore, but welcome this play, not only as a picture of the times, but also as an utterance of the poet's own deliberate convictions; and we feel that we may put the best interpretation on the many ambiguous sentences, for which he has only himself to thank if they have been misunderstood in years past, and which perhaps did then express the haze and mist of early opinions which have since become clearer.

Writers, and especially writers of works of imagination, are sure to develope and change somewhat during forty years of authorship; and we are ready to hope that the high moral tone, which has at all times marked the Poet-Laureate's productions, is gaining force and strength in his evening hours, from a more definite grasp of that true Protestantism which has its roots in Holy Scripture. We may not be always able to agree with him, but he errs by defect rather than excess. We would fain hope that as he draws nearer to the time which must solve for him the enigma of existence, he has learnt to admire the Archbishop who, after much vacillation, clung to a truth in which he was ready to die.

We remember the notable phrase as to the faith that lies in "honest doubt," but that doubt exercised on matters of Divine Revelation can only be a transition state. If honest, it must end in submission and acquiescence; if dishonest, and only a cloke for lawlessness, it will freeze into cold and hard negation. One who long "guessed at truth," and seems to have lost much of the indefiniteness of *his* creed in his championship of another reformer, Luther,—says that a man's third word, if he gets to it, is "Yes." We hope that the Laureate has got to this word. That high moral tone of which we spoke is strikingly illustrated in one of his earlier poems, *Love and Duty*:—

> Will some one say, then why not ill for good?
> Why took ye not your pastime? To that man
> My work shall answer, since I knew the right
> And did it; for *a man is not as God,*
> *But then most God-like being most a man.*

We cannot but contrast such principles as these with those of Byron or Gœthe, or of more modern German (and, alas, also English) novelists. The assertion here of the supremacy of conscience—the moral law of right and wrong—pervades all Mr. Tennyson's works, and one that doeth truth cometh to the light.

One of the chiefest offences which our dramatist has given is found in his Christmas song—

> Ring in the Christ that is to be.

He has only himself again to thank if he has been misinterpreted, for his love of condensation makes him obscure;

Digitized by Google

and his words might easily be interpreted as an anticipation of a new Messiah in the future. Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, familiarized by Mr. Carlyle to English readers, hints at something to come, higher and better than Christianity: and it is no wonder if the Laureate were credited with having taken his colour from this notion. But we find that we were mistaken. He will not trouble to set himself right with his own countrymen, but when the charge was made against him by Dr. F. C. Lee, of All Saints', Lambeth, he writes to an American correspondent:—

"I may remark that I have not written 'that *other* Christ to be.' Apparently your Correspondent has never heard of the Second Advent. There was a fair way for him to walk in, but he puts his own stumbling-block thereon, and when he has broken his shins against it, would fain break my head too."

This drama, like Mr. Gladstone's pamphlets, is a strong indication of the drift of popular thought. All seems converging to a great struggle, perhaps the greatest; and whatever quickens our national horror and hatred of a system denounced alike by our civil and ecclesiastical documents must be welcomed as an aid to that cause of Scriptural Truth for which we too, in our measure, may be called to suffer.

The Obligations of Truth in Religious Controversy. By Edward Garbett, M.A., etc. London: Hunt. 1874.

Evangelical Principles. Doctrinal Papers on the Positive Principles of Evangelical Churchmanship. Edited by the Rev. Edward Garbett. London: Hunt. 1875.

For both of the works whose titles are prefixed to this article we are indebted to the indefatigable energy and vigilance of Mr. Garbett. The papers which constitute the latter of the two for the most part appeared in *The Christian Advocate* before the amalgamation of that periodical with *The Christian Observer*. We therefore feel ourselves in a position to offer an independent opinion upon it, although our notice may from the cause mentioned be less copious than it otherwise would have been. So many who habitually read our pages are familiar with the papers making up the volume entitled "Evangelical Principles" that it would be superfluous to reproduce specimens of them. Rather would we direct our friends to the motive which originally instigated the production of these valuable statements of principle

Digitized by Google

and doctrine. This is ably stated by Mr. Garbett in the introduction which he has added to the papers in this collected form:—

"It is of the utmost possible importance to the Church of England, amid the throes of her present agitation, that the various orthodox sections of the Church should be able to understand and appreciate each others opinions. It is not too much to say, that the Church of England is in danger of being ruined by the inexplicable alienation of the High Church section from the Evangelical section of her members. Were the two combined, as they are in substantial unity of faith, and therefore should be in practical identity of action, the sacerdotal Ritualism now dividing the Church would become powerless for mischief. Not only do not High Churchmen take any active steps to resist its encroachments, but on practical questions they generally throw their influence against those who resist them. They regard, with almost avowed dislike, the Evangelicals with whom they are united on the great doctrines of the faith, and throw the shelter of their support over the school whose practices they dislike and whose doctrines they condemn. Various influences no doubt concur to produce this perilous anomaly, and among others a sensitive jealousy over the comprehensiveness of the Church, and an excessive fear lest any section of her members should be driven from her pale. But another influence is also at work, and has been prominently forced upon the attention of thinking men during recent Church Congresses. It consists of a deep and wide-spread misapprehension, on the part of High Churchmen, of the principles and tendencies of Evangelical Churchmen. It has been thought by many that Evangelical Churchmen have no Church principles, and are little better than Nonconformists within the Church. It is needless to say that this is a total and absolute mistake. The Evangelical members of the Church of England are as firm and as faithful Churchmen as any within her pale, and yield to none in the sincerity of their attachment to the apostolic order of the Church, as well as to her apostolic doctrines, and in their desire to maintain it unimpaired. The existence of misapprehensions, all the more powerful because their influence is unconscious and unintentional, renders it important that a clear statement of Evangelical principles should be issued."

In these sentiments we most heartily coincide, and we are not without hope that the temperate yet firm manner in which Evangelical principles have been expounded and maintained in this volume may influence favourably those who now are so unaccountably found upholding men whom they must revolt from, if only from the extravagant caricature they present of practices and principles dear to High Churchmen. If, as has been said, imitation is the most subtle form of flattery, it might well be supposed that parody would be the most offensive, and yet when this parody is carried to a verge so extreme that it

Digitized by Google

is hard to distinguish it from Romanism, High Churchmen can be found to be apologists for all extravagances, and would fain let it alone. Much of this may and probably does proceed from misapprehension, and from the persevering efforts made at misrepresenting what Evangelical principles really are. It is of importance, therefore, to those who maintain them, that in these busy days, when there is little leisure or inclination for profound research, that Evangelicals should be able to furnish doubting friend or courteous foe with a brief yet plain exposition of their views, presented in a way not calculated to give needless offence, and yet clear and explicit. In this consensus of some of the principal Evangelical teachers of the present time there is a guarantee that the opinions advanced are not the solitary convictions of an individual but the general tenets of a body. The importance attached to one paper may exceed that attributed to another, and estimates may differ as to the ability with which particular subjects have been handled; but it will be felt, as the volume is read, that all have principles which are held in common, and although this manifesto comes unaccredited by any official authority, and is after all only the expression of individual opinion, yet it is opinion prevalent among multitudes, and may be fairly assumed to be that which they upon the whole maintain. We have no fear that the result of a careful perusal, with a fair amount of candid construction, will lead those who may not sympathize with Evangelical views to feel that much can be urged in favour of them, and that there is no reason why common cause should not be made with them against Rationalism and against Romanism, which we venture to assume are as distasteful to High as to Low Churchmen. Where there is sympathy with Romanism or Rationalism, whether that sympathy is open or concealed, it is not likely that a book like that which we have been noticing will produce conviction, for it is distinctly hostile to both these fatal errors, neither of which ought to find lodgment within the precincts of the Church of England. Both are condemned by her formularies, and are as inconsistent with the teaching of Hooker, of Jeremy Taylor, of Bull, of Barrow, of Pearson, of Beveridge, as they are with that of any Evangelical teacher, whether past or present. There would be little reason why Low Churchmen should or would hold themselves aloof from High Churchmen if it were not for the doubtful allies with whom the latter are leagued. It would be a gratifying thing if the publication of the volume we have been noticing were to conduce to a recognition upon the part of High Churchmen of the general soundness of Evangelical views, though probably on some points they would be reluctant to sympathise with them and to adopt them for their own.

Digitized by Google

While the whole scope and tenor of the one volume is to promote that which makes for peace, very different is the tendency of that entitled "The Obligations of Truth in Religious Controversy." It is essentially controversial, and even from the title it may be gathered that an unpleasant task has to be performed. We feel bound to say for Mr. Garbett, that he has discharged his painful duty without needless asperity, and with careful abstinence from all imputation of unworthy motives. It is not his fault that exposures are made which seem to be of the most distressing kind, and which are most damaging to the character of Mr. Gray, of Helmsley, against whose pamphlet Mr. Garbett's animadversions are directed. It is still to be hoped that he can or will plead the superficiality springing from ignorance as his plea in mitigation.

What has given occasion to Mr. Garbett's volume is the publication of a pamphlet by Mr. Gray, entitled "Confession, as Taught in the Church of England. By the Rev. C. N. Gray, Vicar of Helmsley, Yorkshire, late Curate of St. John's, Kidderminster." This has reached a fifth edition, and has been, we know, extensively circulated among young men in our Universities, with very mischievous results. It is peculiarly calculated for them. There is a great show of learning, exhibited in a form which all practical controversialists know to be most dangerous and misleading. A body of quotations is presented from approved English theologians, representing them as teaching habitual confession to man, and that in the sense of some form or other of sacramental confession. This, of course, has a very specious appearance; and where there is a readiness to receive the doctrine urged by Mr. Gray, very few would care to examine further. The sound advice of the old president of Magdalen, Dr. Routh, is not likely to be attended to by thoughtless and superficial young men: "Verify your quotations." The large majority neither have the means nor the ability of doing so. There is the quotation placed before them, and they accept it as quoted, without troubling themselves to ascertain whether it really embodies the teaching of him from whom it is quoted. We are quite willing to believe that Mr. Gray has himself been misled by carelessness in this respect.

In his Introduction Mr. Garbett has specified the various modes in which quotations are falsified. With the exception of the one "coarse method of substituting words not used by an author for the words actually employed by him," he alleges repeated instances of all the others in Mr. Gray's pamphlet. He charges him, first, with an insufficient or misleading statement of the point which the quotations are intended to prove; secondly, with affixing an arbitrary meaning to theological terms which a

Digitized by Google

careful examination shows not to have been the meaning of the author; thirdly, with insufficiency of extract given, or actual omission. The bulk of the volume is devoted to the substantiation of these charges, which is effected in a most exhaustive and masterly manner. We have not heard that Mr. Gray has attempted any rejoinder, or striven by any means to vindicate himself. As a considerable interval has elapsed since the publication of Mr. Garbett's volume, it may be reasonably concluded that silence is considered the wisest policy under circumstances so excessively awkward. Certainly, so far as Mr. Gray's eighty-eight authorities are concerned, it is beyond a question that the Church of England does not teach sacramental confession in any form whatever, "but repudiates it in any and every form in which it can be stated." This would be the natural conclusion of every unsophisticated Englishman, until startled by Mr. Gray's astounding assertions. As some of our readers may not be familiar with Mr. Garbett's book, we produce one or two instances by which they may judge of the value of Mr. Gray as a controversialist. We select them, not as the most flagrant, but as the most convenient for our purpose.

In Mr. Gray's pamphlet Melancthon is made to say,—

"*It would be wicked to take away private absolution from the Church.* Nor if any despise private absolution, do they understand either what remission of sins means, or the power of the keys" (cf. Carter, p. 86). So again (2 Book, "Oper. Inst.," fol. 450): "Absolution. . . . is good and profitable before God, and being so, confession is to be retained in which absolution is asked."

"This extract affords an apt illustration of the unhealthy system of second-hand quotation, habitual among some modern writers. The Pamphlet gives the passage on the authority of the Rev. T. T. Carter, in his work on 'Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England.' On turning to this publication I find that Mr. Carter in his turn gives it on the authority of the Rev. H. G. Newland, in his work, 'Practice of Confession in the Church of England.' On turning to this work I find the passage unauthenticated by any reference whatever. For controversial purposes the passage is therefore worthless. I have been unable to find it, and equally unable to find the second quotation. Two editions of Melancthon's works, which I have consulted, contain no work entitled the 'Institutes.'"

Mr. Garbett then proceeds to show what Melancthon's views on confession were, quoting freely from his works. As another short specimen we quote the version given by Mr. Gray of Dr. Crakanthorp's opinions with Mr. Garbett's exposure. It will be manifest what violence had to be used to extort Dr. Crakanthorp as a witness to establish what Mr. Gray wished.

Digitized by Google

"Dr. Crakanthorp (1624), a vigorous writer against Rome, says: '*Private confession and absolution our Church both approves and teaches. We have not impiously abolished them, as you calumniously assert.*' The quotation is given as if it constituted one passage. The two sentences are, however, parted from each other in the original; and when the entire paragraph is perused, it will be seen that Mr. Gray's quotation conveys a totally incorrect estimate of Crakanthorp's sentences. 'As to auricular confession also abolished among us you deal in a subtle and cunning way. Private confession, by which a man may throw the burden of the distress of his mind on account of sins done by himself alone or in company with others into the breast, and if you like, into the ear of a Presbyter; and also absolution, on a serious and not a feigned repentance for his sin through the keys of the Church entrusted to all Presbyters, our Church both approves and inculcates. Nor do the other reformed Churches differ from us in this.' He then quotes two passages from Calvin, and proceeds: 'We have abolished neither private confession nor absolution; nor have we abolished them impiously, as you calumniously assert. It is that anti-Christian confession of yours into the ear of a priest which is nothing else than a snare of consciences, an abyss of your frauds and a deception of the unlearned: this and nothing else we have abolished, and deservedly condemn it to the pit of hell.'" (Def. Eccl. Angli., cap. lxxx., s. 6, p. 565. Library of anglo-Catholic Divinity, Oxford. 1847.)

The exposure of Mr. Gray's assertions, in order to be thorough, requires so much space that we cannot quote more instances, but must refer our readers to Mr. Garbett's volume. In one case regarding Luther he convicts Mr. Gray of having quoted some passages which he has been unable to trace, not from Luther himself, but from "A Treatise on Auricular Confession," by the Rev. Raphael Melia, D.D., Missionary Apostolic of the Pious Society of the Missions, founded by the servant of God, Viscount Palleotti. Dublin: James Duffy!!! This Roman Catholic priest refers to an edition of Luther, said to be published at Jena, 1546, which Mr. Garbett has searched for in vain. In the case of a quotation from Bishop Hall, Mr. Garbett says,

"The beginning of this quotation occurs in Bishop Hall's 'Resolutions and Decisions in cases of Party and Religion.' It occurs in the opening paragraph of Case IX., which ends with the words, 'betwixt both these.' The last quotation made in the pamphlet constitutes the closing paragraph of the same Case IX., but the passages which lie between I have been unable to find. Their position in the pamphlet would suggest that they are parts of a continuous argument, but this is certainly not the case."

Dean Comber and Bishop Wilson are treated precisely in the same unscrupulous manner. Of the quotations from Archbishop Sharp, Mr. Garbett says, "These passages are so mutilated as to

Digitized by Google

convey an impression totally opposed to the mind of the author." Mr. Gray quotes a passage professedly from Dr. Hickes' preface to "Divine Right of Episcopacy." Mr. Garbett remarks:—

"I have been unable to find this passage, and it is no wonder, from the inexact nature of the reprint. No treatise on 'The Divine Right of Episcopacy' is to be found in the published works of Dr. Hickes; nor do I find any such treatise in the list of his works published by bibliographists. There is a treatise on 'The Dignity of the Episcopal Office' but there is no preface to it. The treatise on 'The Christian Priesthood' is introduced by a prefatory discourse, occupying three-fourths of an octavo volume; but I have not met with the passage quoted in it."

In the instance of Bishop Herbert Marsh, Mr. Garbett is at a loss to conceive how he can have been quoted, "except on the supposition that the author of the pamphet had not read the work himself, but had borrowed the quotation from some other quarter."

It will be seen even from these imperfect references what admirable service Mr. Garbett has done in ripping up and exposing the delusions with which we know many ignorant and unwary young men have been gulled. It might have seemed hardly worth his while to break such a butterfly upon a wheel; but it must be borne in mind that in days like the present, religious controversy is not confined to the learned, but extends largely to simpletons. The pamphlet is extensively circulated, and falls into all sorts of hands. Many would avoid Sacramental Confession if it was merely a practice of the Church of Rome, but they are ensnared into it when it is unblushingly asserted, as by the author of the pamphlet, that there is authority for it amongst the most accredited teachers of the Reformation and of the Church of England. To this end it has been cleverly contrived, although it seems impossible, after perusing Mr. Garbett's volume, to acquit the author of studied disingenuousness, except indeed upon the hypothesis that he has lent his name to a publication of the merits of which he is himself ignorant. It would be pleasant to think that it had been palmed off by some astute and not over-scrupulous Romanist upon him, and that he had thus most unconsciously been victimised by a friend. We do not say that it has been so, but, humiliating as it would be, it would largely save Mr. Gray's credit as a controversialist if a hypothesis of this nature were tenable: anyhow, if the poisonous tractate falls into the hands of any of our readers they will know where to procure a complete antidote. Probably few things would be more convincing to a young man or young woman entangled in the meshes of some Roman sophistry, than

Digitized by Google

to make it clear to them how their credulity is imposed upon in such performances as those of Mr. Gray,

Mr. Garbett's book must have been a difficult one to print so as to present Mr. Gray's statements in clear opposition to the long contrary assertions often necessary, but we could wish that the impatience of readers had been more carefully considered. It often requires very careful attention to follow the reply, keeping before the mind what it is the reply to. This may detract somewhat from its popularity, but those who are really interested in the controversy will feel grateful to Mr. Garbett for his most able vindication of the true teaching of the Church of England upon this vexed question of the day.

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. VII.

Its Bearing on Christian Worship and Ministrations.

AT the commencement of these papers it was proposed to investigate the sacrificial system appointed by God to Israel, in order to trace its bearing on the Saviour's atoning work, and on the position, rites, and ministrations of the Christian Church. In the last paper it was shown from the writings of the New Testament, that the atoning or propitiatory element in all the offerings was fulfilled in Christ, who suffered by Divine appointment, the Just for the unjust. It was also laid down as the clear teaching of Scripture, that as the blood of the sin-offering was taken by the priest once a year into the most holy place, so Christ, when He had been perfected through suffering, and had entered into His High Priesthood (after His resurrection), presented His own atoning blood before the Most High, once for all. From that time forward the virtue of His one offering has been applicable to the case of every one who seeks mercy from God; and thus, whosoever calls upon the name of the Lord, is saved.

The more we consider this glorious truth, the more we shall find the reasonableness of God's way of atonement. The bloody rites of heathenism are a distortion, almost a caricature of the truth. The ritual of Israel was, on the contrary, a true foreshadowing of the way of acceptance to be opened for fallen man. But now the shadow has given way to the substance: the darkness has past, and the true light now shineth. God has wrought salvation for us through His own Son, who has been clothed in human nature, has borne the penalty appointed for man's sin, has satisfied the need of justice, has opened the way of mercy,

Digitized by Google

and has touched a spring whereby every heart may be opened and drawn back to a loving Father. All is of God, who has reconciled us to Himself, through the death of His Son.

Surely this course satisfies the demands of our highest reason, —the reason of the heart,—as well as the claims of the conscience. It can be illustrated by many analogies in human nature and history, though it rises infinitely above them in excellence and importance. It is, indeed, quite possible that the terms by which the atonement is expressed, are not only inadequate to express the whole truth, but are also more complicated than the grand reality, because owing to the union of the human and Divine natures in Christ, the blood shed upon the cross was there and then brought into immediate contact with God. Still, whilst acknowledging the inadequacy of the most accurate human words to express the marvellous transaction whereby redemption was effected, we do well to accept "as little children" the words of Scripture which speak of our Great High Priest as presenting His own blood before God in the heavens, having gathered into Himself the atoning efficacy of the blood, and the mediatorial efficacy of the priest.

It now remains that certain practical questions should be considered. And first, what is the position of the Christian worshipper now, as compared with the Jewish worshippers of old times? Are we better off, or worse off than they? We have evidently lost something which they had. We have lost the constant appeal to the senses,—the frequent sight of a smoking, blood-stained altar, of a priest in gorgeous vestments, of a sumptuous tabernacle or temple, of the vapour of offerings and of incense ascending into the heavens. We no longer press our hands on the head of unoffending and unconscious lambs, kids, or bullocks; we no longer drag them, all reluctant, to the altar, bind them to its horns, slay them there, and then stand by and watch while a son of Aaron sprinkles the blood, and burns the whole or part of the victim. All this, which was very impressive and very instructive, has passed away. What have we gained instead? We have still a High Priest. He is invisible, indeed, to the eye of flesh, but we believe that He ever liveth at God's right hand to act for us. One Offering has taken the place of all the rest. It has been made once on Calvary, for the sin of all the world; and though we were not present at the time, *some* were, and we know that their record is true. By faith we can still lay our hand on the head of the Lamb of God, and confess our sin over Him. By faith we can see Him bearing our sins on the cross,—dying, and thus liberating Himself and us from their effects, thus rising to newness of life, and ascending into the heavens. By faith we can realize that we are accepted

Digitized by Google

in the Beloved, pardoned through His blood, justified by His death, complete in Him, brought near to the Holy God through the mediation of His Son. The atoning merit of Him who ever liveth in His Father's presence *for us*, is the incense whereby our praises, prayers, gifts, and services, ascend as a well-pleasing odour to the Father's presence. There is no need to journey to a particular building, to call in the services of one of a particular tribe, or to be provided with a particular animal, in order to approach God. Every place is hallowed ground, and is equally near to that Jerusalem which is above. Our High Priest can be approached instantaneously by old or young, by rich or poor, by men of all nationalities, and under all circumstances. Nay, more: there is a freedom of access, a holy boldness in our approach to God in Christ, to which the Jew under the Old Dispensation was generally speaking a stranger. The enclosure, the tabernacle, the veil, the priest, seemed in a measure to separate him from God. They showed him that God was willing to be approached, but that "the way was not as yet made manifest." Now we approach through a new and living Way, "that we may find grace and mercy in every time of need." Nor are we liable to be offended or misled now, as in the days when the sons of Eli caused the Lord's people to offend, or when the prophets prophesied falsely, and the priests bore rule by their means. Our Priest is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher than the heavens, perfected through suffering; able to sympathize with the tempted, because He has been tempted Himself; and able to succour them, because all power is at His command, in heaven and in earth.

Thus the sensible has given way to the spiritual, the imperfect and transitory to the perfect and eternal. The Christian walks by faith, whereas the Jew to a great extent had to walk by sight. The child has grown into a man. He has his offerings to present now as before. They are not less, but more in extent, though of a less ceremonial character, and less subjected to stringent regulations in their nature and in the mode of their presentation. Moved by God's tender mercies, the Christian presents his body as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ. His service is reasonable or rational as compared with the typical and unintelligible rites of ancient days. (Rom. xii. 1.) His almsdeeds and self-denying work for the poor, or for missions, are "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God." (Heb. xiii. 16; Phil. iv. 18.) Through Christ he offers the sacrifice of praise to God continually (that is, the fruit of the lips), giving open acknowledgment of praise and thanksgiving to His name. (Heb. xiii. 15.) Having such a High Priest, he draws near to God

Digitized by Google

with a heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and a body washed with pure water. (Heb. x. 22.) His life may have to be shed forth as a drink-offering (2 Tim. iv. 6), as his Master's was before him;"[a] but he knows whom he has believed, and the offering of himself will be accepted through Christ.

Again, under the Old Dispensation, the offerer died symbolically and representatively when the victim died. When the victim's body was laid upon the altar, it was as if *his* body was laid there; and when the burning flesh arose as sweet vapour, it was as though *he* arose. So the Christian counts himself as crucified with Christ. If One died for all, then all died. He is buried and risen again with Him, and seated with Him in heavenly places. The Israelite was identified ceremonially with the lower animal, which was but a rude type; but the Christian is identified spiritually with God's own Son, the Lamb of God, the world's Sin-bearer. The rising up of the older victim was only mechanical, except in the case of certain complex offerings, where, after the dead victim was slain, the living one was allowed to escape. But the Christian, who regards Himself as having died when Christ died, is now sharing his Saviour's resurrection life. Because the Lord lives, the Christian lives.

Once more, the whole aspect of the Christian's heart consciousness and life towards God, is not that of a trembling culprit or a cowering slave, but that of a redeemed servant, and of an adopted and reconciled son. "O Lord," he says, "I am Thy servant: Thou hast loosed my bonds." The seeds of perfect love are sown in his heart, and perfect love casteth out slavish fear. His sins and iniquities are remembered no more. He has no more conscience of sin; that is to say, he knows that God is faithful and just to forgive him, and to cleanse him from all unrighteousness. The blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from dead works, to serve the living God.

Lastly, the nation of Israel was chosen to be a kingdom of priests, in order that they might bear witness to God's truth amidst the surrounding nations, by virtue of their high privileges and comparative enlightenment. So, too, the whole Christian Church is a royal priesthood, intended to show forth in the world the praises of Him who had called them out of darkness into His marvellous light. They are "the priests of the Lord;" and thus in them God is fulfilling, in some measure, the promises made to His ancient people, and recorded in such passages as Is. lxi. 6; lxvi. 21; and Jer. xxxiii. 21, 22,—passages which may yet have a more literal fulfilment in the days of Israel's restoration.

[a] See Ps. ii. 6: "I have *set* my King." Literally, "I have *poured out* my King *as a drink-offering*."

Digitized by Google

We have now to approach a second and a deeply practical question, and one the treatment of which calls for much calmness and forbearance, owing both to the excited state of public opinion on the matter, and also to the fact that the Scriptures only give us a few principles and illustrations for our guidance. May God help us to face it wisely and charitably, not in the interests of party, but in the service of truth!

The question is this: *How far may Jewish ritual be adopted in Christian worship?* Although the Levitical ritual has vanished away, having served its purpose, which was to typify and prefigure the acceptance of the sinner through Christ, yet there were many means of grace in existence among the Jews which were not typical, and which have descended in unbroken line to ourselves. The altar-service in all its parts has passed away, and it is evidently as much an anachronism to use incense in worship now, as it would be to sprinkle the blood of a lamb on an altar. Both these rites were sacred to the Levitical priesthood; none else dare interfere with them, and that which they typified is concentrated in Christ. But prayer remains, and praise remains. To kneel or stand in prayer, to have instrumental accompaniments to sacred song, are as decorous and appropriate now as ever, for they were not typical of the work of Christ. Thank-offerings to God are not done away with, though their mode of presentation is different. The wheaten offering may still be dedicated to God, for corn is still the standard of wealth; but instead of a piece being laid on the altar-fire by an earthly priest, and the rest eaten by him, the whole may be used for God's service, and part may be given to the poor in Christ's name, and then, like the prayers and alms of Cornelius, it will ascend as a "memorial" before the Lord. (Acts x. 4.) The Christian's obligation to spend his wealth in God's service is not less, but more than that of the Jew. If the one presented the slain body of an animal, the other presents his own bodily life, and all its energies, as a living offering. Whether he eats or drinks, or whatsoever he does, he does all to God. His life is to be one continued act of worship. This fact, however, does not exclude him from the use of means of grace, and from the adoption of a certain amount of ceremonial in his mode of approach to the Most High; and the real question is to determine how far it is either wise or right to practise ceremonies similar or analogous to those in use among the Israelites under the Old Dispensation. The answer appears to be this: So long as modes of worship do not trench upon the sacred offices which the Lord now concentrates in Himself, they may be adopted by any particular Church, provided they are consistent with the great apostolic principles of order and edification.

Digitized by Google

But the question thus briefly answered leads to another: *How far are the ministrations of the Christian presbyter or pastor analogous with those of the Jewish priest or Levite?* It is evident that the terms applied in the New Testament to Christian ministrations and worship, are derived from the usages of the synagogue rather than from those of the tabernacle or temple.[b] It is also generally allowed that the strictly sacerdotal functions of the house of Aaron are absorbed in the Person of Christ. Yet it must be acknowledged that there is a certain analogy between the ministry of the Gospel and the functions of *the Levites.* Just as members of this tribe were specially appointed to minister to the high priest, so the Apostles, presbyters, and pastors, are represented as carrying out the work of Christ amongst men. "We are ambassadors for Christ." "We beseech you in Christ's behalf. We, as fellow-workers (with Him), beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God to no profit." (2 Cor. v. 20, and vi. 1.) This view of the analogy between Levitical and Christian ministrations is slightly confirmed by a reference to Acts xiii. 2. Here we read, "As they *ministered* to the Lord and fasted." The Greek word here used is frequently (though not exclusively) applied in the LXX. to the sacred duties of those who ministered to the Lord under the Old Dispensation.

Once more: St. Paul seems to have regarded himself as a Christian Levite (if we might use such an expression) in Rom. xv. 16, where he speaks of the grace given unto him, that he should be a *minister* of the High Priest Jesus Christ unto the nations, performing the sacred office of preaching the Gospel of God, in order that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit. The more carefully one weighs the expressions found in this passage, the more one is led to the conclusion that there is Scriptural ground for affirming that some analogy exists between the service rendered by the Levites to the priests, and the ministrations rendered by presbyters and pastors to Christ, who is our one Priest.

Now what were the duties of the Levites? Not to offer sacrifices, not to sprinkle the blood, not to offer incense; these were all sacerdotal duties, and the infringement of them by the Levites met with even a more severe chastisement in the case of Korah the Levite, than in the case of Uzziah the King. There may have been exceptional instances in which the Levites were allowed to exceed their duties, but no argument could fairly be founded on such instances. The work of the Levites was to

[b] Vitringa has exhibited the arguments bearing on this subject with great learning, in his work on the Synagogue. For an examination of all the Biblical terms bearing on worship and ministrations, reference may be permitted to the "Synonyms of the Old Testament," chs. 18, 19, and 20.

Digitized by Google

assist the priests, to perform various subsidiary duties; all honourable, indeed, but not propitiatory or mediatorial. Moreover, they seem to have been teachers and expositors of the law. (See, for example, 2 Chron. xvii. 7—9.) They also occasionally acted as substitutes or representatives of any of the Children of Israel who happened to be ceremonially unclean, and who thus were restricted from performing certain duties incumbent on them. The three classes of service thus laid upon the Levites are found incidentally mentioned together in the following passage relating to the time of Hezekiah: "Then they (*i.e.*, the people) killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the second month: and the priests and the Levites were ashamed, and sanctified themselves, and brought in the burnt-offerings into the house of the Lord. And they stood in their place after their manner, according to the law of Moses the man of God: *the priests sprinkled the blood, which they received of the hand of the Levites.* For there were many in the congregation that were not sanctified: therefore *the Levites had the charge of the killing of the passovers for every one that was not clean.* . . . . And Hezekiah spake comfortably unto all *the Levites that taught the good knowledge of the Lord.*" (2 Chron. xxx. 15—22.)

Thus the Levites ministered to the priests, and the priests offered. What, then, was "the offering of the Gentiles" to which St. Paul referred? (Rom. xv.) To answer this question, we must return for a moment to the consideration of the varied aspects of Christ's work. Just as Christ was the true Temple of God, and yet Christians also are His temple, so Christ was the true Offering, and yet Christians also are an offering. The Offering of Christ Himself was once for all; but Christians are constantly presenting their bodies as living sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God. And who is it that offers them, and all their works, prayers, and praises, to the Most High? It is our High Priest. In this sense He has still "somewhat to offer," and this was the very object of His own atoning work,—that He might sanctify the *people* through His blood (Heb. xiii. 12); or, as St. Peter says, "He died, the Just for the unjust, that He might offer us[c] to God." (1 Peter iii. 18.) Christ, then, is the High Priest who offers the Gentiles to God; and St. Paul, acting as a Levite, ministered in a subsidiary position, through the faithful proclamation of that Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation. This is the true office of the Christian minister, and surely it is a very high one. Why, then, should he incur the anger of God by seeking the priesthood also? Let him

[c] This is the rendering of the Latin Vulgate, which here, as so often, catches the true spirit of the sacred writings.

Digitized by Google

rejoice in the honour bestowed on him as a Christian Levite, called to do service to Him who is a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek.

Reverting for a moment to the letter from the late Archdeacon Freeman, quoted in the first of these papers, we are prepared to deal with it in the form of question and answer, thus:—

(i.) Is it true that Christ ordained His own priests, when He said to His gathered disciples[d] after His resurrection, "As the Father hath sent Me, even so do I send you"? We answer, No: the High Priest stands alone *as Priest*, in the strict sense of the word; but He called His disciples to take the place of Levites,—ministers to His Priesthood.

(ii.) Do the gifts bestowed on the Apostles descend, by laying on of hands, to their successors? *Sacerdotal* gifts were not bestowed; so that there is no call to consider the question of ministerial gifts here.

(iii.) Does God take of the priestly spirit that is in Christ, and put it on English presbyters? No: it is reserved for Christ Himself. The ministerial spirit is communicated, but not the sacerdotal.

(iv.) Was the rite at which the Jewish priest officiated "the most stupendous of all miracles, except the incarnation"? No: it typified the work of Christ in presenting His one offering of Himself to God. That work is in itself, indeed, an infinite

---

[d] The promise contained in John xx. was not restricted to the twelve Apostles. The subjoined extract of a letter from the Rev. E. Huxtable to the *Guardian* puts this point admirably:—

"(*a*) The Apostles were not the only 'disciples' present on that occasion (Luke xxiv. 33); (*b*) St. John himself in ch. vi. 66, 67, uses the word 'disciples' intentionally as a wider term than 'the Twelve,' and probably does so here,—*cf.* v. 24; (*c*) the *promise* of the Holy Spirit guaranteed by our Lord through His 'breathing on them' was *fulfilled* on the Day of Pentecost to the whole assembled Church, and not to the Apostles only; *cf.* Acts i. 15; ii. 1, 17, 39.

"Our Lord, in departing from the world, delegated to His whole Church, along with the guarantee of the enabling gift of the Holy Spirit, which was to dwell in the whole community, the function which He Himself could thenceforward no longer in Person discharge,—viz., the function of announcing to the world the terms of salvation; that is, of declaring what manner of men might be assured of forgiveness (Luke xxiv. 47), and what manner of men should be incapable of receiving it.

"This function was, in some respects, as in ascertaining the rule of faith, and in embodying it in permanent records, discharged in the Apostolic age 'once for all.' (ἅπαξ, Jude v. 3.) But, in other respects, the Church has to exercise the function throughout all time,—as by preaching; by in other ways proclaiming the truth; by applying it from time to time to the varying conditions of life, and to the varying phases of human thought; by sacraments which both declare and seal the grace of pardon; by the exercise of discipline. These offices appertain to the whole body, no member of which is at liberty to forego the duty of discharging them so far as he may; but of necessity the Church in large measure exercises them through the ministry which she especially sets apart for the purpose."

Digitized by Google

mystery. But the terms in which the priest's office is here spoken of are exaggerated, and tend to mislead the reader.

(v.) Was confession made to a priest, and pardon actually conveyed by a priest? Not necessarily. The priest was to have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that were out of the way; but the hearing of confessions was not one of his specified duties. Just as the pardon of sin was exhibited in his work of presenting the acceptance offering to God, so the confession of sin was implied in the bringing of a sin-offering to the tabernacle.

(vi.) Are "due consecration" and "the verbal message of pardon," the peculiar functions restricted to the Christian priesthood? The answer to this question is clear from the conclusions already arrived at. If "due consecration" means anything analogous to the Jewish priest's work, then it is restricted to Christ Himself. As for "the verbal message of pardon," it was not the peculiar function of either priest or Levite under the Old Dispensation, and therefore it must not be restricted to one set of men under the Christian Dispensation, unless there is a clear command to that effect in the Scriptures.

Once more, it may be asked, granting the universal priesthood of believers, is the Christian ministry a specific priesthood? There would be no harm in the title if it were used in a general sense, just as the Levites are apparently ranked with priests, if not called by that name in certain passages of Scripture.[e] But the term is evidently not an accurate one, and it needs to be carefully guarded from abuse. It has been frequently observed that no distinctly sacerdotal terms are applied to the minister in the New Testament. Certainly if presbyters were the successors of the Jewish priests, or even if they held an analogous office, the sacred writers would have adopted very different language. The inspired teachers permit the *Levitical* analogy to lie by implication in their writings, but the sacerdotal *never*. The conclusion is obvious.

It only remains to be noticed that the Levites were not only ministers to the priest, but also representatives of the people. God took them and their goods instead of the first-born of the people (Num. iii. 12, 13), and the Children of Israel (acting no doubt through their representatives, the elders) put their hands upon them. (Num. viii. 10.) Similarly, Christian ministers are dedicated to God as representives of the people, whose time shall be wholly taken up with ministrations to the one High

[e] See Deut. xvii. 9; Jos. iii. 3; 1 Kings viii. 4; Jer. xxxiii. 21. The expressions used in these passages, "the priests," "the Levites," *may* only signify "the priests who are of the house of Levi." Compare the expression in Heb. vii. 11, "the Levitical priesthood."

Digitized by Google

Priest. Have we not in this analogy a strong call to Christian families to dedicate the best and ablest of their children, and also the firstfruits of their increase, to the service of God? Have we not also here the true idea which the Christian minister should form with respect to his position? He is representing the congregation whilst engaged in ministering to the Priest. The congregation commit to him the charge of the holy things, —of preaching, expounding the Scripture, and administering the rites of the Church,—and he fulfils the charge committed to him publicly through the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, feeling sure that God, who has inwardly moved him to undertake the work, will supply him with the grace needful for its performance.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

A PLEA FOR THE SUPERNATURAL IN JOSHUA X.

THE incident recorded in Holy Writ concerning the standing still of the sun and moon—Joshua x. 12—15—is summed up in the "Speaker's Commentary"[a] (note on ver. 12, and supplementary note C), in a way which to many must seem singularly unsatisfactory and justifying some further remarks. The difficulties attached to the passage are sufficiently weighty to procure it the longest textual notice in the second volume, and it at length emerges, after undergoing manipulation from every quarter, so divested of its realistic features, and so attenuated as scarce to leave its retention in Scripture worth consideration.

It would seem, from reading the comments alluded to, that they were written by different individuals, the earlier writer undertaking to expound the actual *locus standi* at the time when Joshua uttered his heroic appeal; the writer of the supplementary Note C, on the other hand, concluding the whole passage and relation to be a mere poetical figure, afterward unlawfully intruded into the text by a later copyist; a diversity of description which it is somewhat difficult to reconcile.

The general objections mentioned against its literal application to an historical fact are:—

(1) The Poetical and Rhythmical structure of the passage.

(2) Its abrupt insertion.

---

[a] For some valuable remarks on this very unsatisfactory portion of the "Speaker's Commentary," see *The Christian Observer* for July, 1873, where Mr. Espin's objectionable treatment of this important subject has been very ably discussed, and commented upon with due animadversion.

Digitized by Google

(3) The somewhat exceptional phraseology.

(4) That no record is given in profane chronological calculations. It is not mentioned in Heb. xi.; and if alluded to in Isaiah xxviii. 21, and Habbakuk iii. 11, is doubtful.

"Recent commentators," adds the writer of Note C, "have judged the narration as to be taken in a popular and poetical sense, and not in a literal; and the whole passage ought, on critical grounds, to be regarded as a fragment of unknown date and authorship, interpolated later on into the text of the Book; it being in truth but a fictitious apostrophe which the poetical author did not dream would be afterward quoted and inserted as a literal fact."

In replying to these various arguments, the "poetry of structure" and "abruptness of insertion" are but of comparatively minor consequence to the subject, the point being how far evidence in favour of any literal foundation may be adduced.

The recognition of any instance of Scriptural interpolation ought only, we conceive, to be admitted after all other tests and conjectures have been reasonably defeated. Have they been finally in the present case? Before consenting to this, we offer the following remarks as not unworthy of consideration.

The presence of Jehovah among His chosen people from the day of His appearing in Horeb's burning bush to Moses, had been manifested in the most signal and striking manner. Appropriating to Himself the office of Leader and Commander, the advancing steps of Israel had been marked with a series of astounding Divine interpositions, such as the world had never before witnessed, and each succeeding display eclipsing its predecessor. It was the triumphant onward march of the great "I am" over the prostrate forms of all whom the heathen imagined gods and worshipped. "Upon all their gods will I execute vengeance," was the continual pervading spirit and feeling manifested: "I, and I only, am alone Jehovah."

It was but natural that such a succession of triumphs should culminate in something of a like prodigious character to that which our subject expresses. The battle which was being fought in the neighbourhood of royal Gibeon, was in a great measure to decide the campaign. Brought out face to face with the Anakim host of Canaan, the armies of Israel must either come off victorious in the impending sanguinary struggle, or succumb to an enemy who knew no mercy to the invader. But at the head of chosen Israel is an invincible Leader, the שַׂר צְבָא יְהוָה, who, as he had been beforetime with Moses, is now as Captain of the Lord's host with His servant Joshua. And now the engagement begins. The Amoritish warriors advance, invoking their national devil-deities for success, while Israel comes on in the name of the

Digitized by Google

Lord of Hosts. The shock of conflict is tremendous, but of brief duration. Beset from above and in front by an invincible foe, they are completely routed, and seek safety in precipitate flight. The approaching darkness, together with the well-known hiding places of Beth-horon's rocky caverns will shut them in, and maybe enable them to rally their scattered forces. Their hope is in vain. Inspired by the Divine direction and presence, the appeal of Joshua is uttered; and obedient, not to the cry of the individual so much as to the command of Him who invisibly headed the victors, the great orbs of day and night ceased not to relax their assistance or withdraw their light until the idolatrous foes of Jehovah were all destroyed. It was the greatest of all the Almighty's interventions, and it was also the last. It was, as we have said the deciding conflict: it established Israel in the land as conqueror and possessor; and though succeeded by an engagement with yet greater numbers, that was only in the confines of the country, at the waters of Merom, and in which the already demoralized and terror striken foe was to be mown down like the grass. Henceforth it was no longer a struggle for victory but an avenging and retributive slaughter.

But further, there was a yet ulterior reason that such a miracle as this recorded of the sun and moon should be performed. The inhabitants of Canaan, in common with the rest of the Hamitic family, subverting the worship of the unseen Jehovah for that of something visible and material, had enslaved themselves to a rank idolatry. In their migration from the Chaldaic Fatherland westward, they had brought with them this prevalent worship of the sun, moon, and stars, as having direct influence over the lives and destinies of mankind. These heavenly bodies were represented under different emblems or images, according to their situation and position in their supposed course through the celestial sphere or circle, and all the deities or gods of their neighbours and co-descendants, the Phœnicians, the Zidonians, the Amorites, the Philistines, the Moabites, Egyptians, and others, were but varied symbols of the same originals, under similar aspects and configurations. It would not be uninteresting, were it not beside the subject, to go on to show how a Chaldaic, Assyrian, Babylonish materialistic and sensuous pseudo-theology has over and over, and yet does exalt its seven-headed form against the throne of Jehovah, whether it be more prominently depicted in the seven nations of the Amorites, the seven administered Empire of Nebuchadnezzar, or the seven hilled or eminenced city, Great Babylon of the present,—Rome: and further also, how in the mysterious wisdom of the Eternal, it has been ordained that a grand thrice repeated struggle should be fought out in the world's history between the hostile forces of Babylonish antichrist, and

Digitized by Google

the spiritual church of Jesus Christ the Messiah. Again, how in the crushing of the Progenitor, Shinaric Babylon and its satellites, in the era from Babel to the conquest of Canaan, the person and glory of God the Creator and Father became displayed, and the kingdom of His justice established; how in the shattering and dissolution of its opposing Chaldean Babylon and its dependencies the person and glory of God the Son was revealed, and the kingdom of His grace established; and how in the demolition and final destruction of their present faithful imitator, Roman Babylon and her votaries, the person and glory of the Holy Spirit shall be brought signally to view, and the kingdom of holiness established, culminating in eternal shame on the one side and endless glory on the other.

But to return. It was here, before beleaguered Gibeon, that the test was to be. The proof to be evidenced before the assembled hosts of Israel and Canaan, and through them to the nations round, was whether of the twain who was there represented by his armies was God: he, the Sun-deity, adored under the titles of Chemosh, Baal, Thammur, Moloch, Bel, Nisroch, Osiris, Malcham, Rimmon, Dagon, and a legion of other names according to his situation above or beneath the horizon, or the Lord Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel. The daring challenge by intrepid Joshua was uttered, and the result decisive and crushing: "He, Jehovah, spake the word" (by His servant, always by His servants), "and it was done: He commanded, and it stood fast." The astonishment and dismay of the Amoritish host, believing as they did in that day (and long after), in the circling motion of the sun, were overwhelming. Their retreat became a frenzied flight. The calculations of theology and astrology and all that belonged to their ideas of Deity were overthrown at a stroke. No wonder the chronological scribes and horoscopists, who were also the priesthood, were not careful to find place for such an astounding phenomenon in their annals, since such an admission would have soon brought down the vast superstructure of mythology and mystic divination into irretrievable chaos and ruin.

Thanks to God, the enlightened intellects of a Galileo and a Newton, in the discovery of the true laws of gravitation, have levelled at least one of the grand delusions of the past to the dust for ever.

The view put forth, that the miracle is not elsewhere referred to, is unquestionably far from conclusive. The great events connected with the life of ancient Israel, stupendous as they were, but symbolized a still greater series of transactions connected with the triumphant establishment of Christ's kingdom of spiritual Israel. And this same idea seems apparently to be present to the mind of Isaiah, where we find him, while dwelling (chap.

Digitized by Google

xxviii. 21), upon God's "strange work in the valley of Gibeon," also in the same prophetic strain (chap. xxx. 26), coupling with it the prediction, that in the day in which the Lord shall heal the breach of His people and overwhelm the Assyrian foe, "the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days," where the expanded idea of the miracle recorded in Joshua x. is evidently intended to be understood; and it is this great day of the Lord's salvation and vengeance to which allusion is made all down through the pages of Prophet, Evangelist, and Apostle, and winding up in the book of Revelation; when light and holiness shall triumph over the kingdom of darkness and evil, not for an interval only, but for ever and ever: "there shall be no night there."

The passage in Habakkuk iii. 11, seems to bear almost indisputable reference to the Bethhoron miracle. Let any one take notice of the advancing steps (ver. 3—14) in the Prophet's description, and compare them with the Pentateuch narrative of the experiences of Israel from the circumstances of their exodus from Egypt, and onward to the times of the Judges, and the fact recounted in ver. 11 will be found, as applied to Joshua x., to fall into its place with befitting harmony and in chronological order. And it may be safely held as a rule that in the various utterances and lays of the sacred poets the solid kernel of truth and historical fact lies always ensconced in the embellishing foliage of lofty sentiment and rhythm.

That such able commentators as Hengstenberg, Keil, Hatzig, etc., should suppose the Prophet to be here alluding to an eclipse, is so unaccountable as to lead one to imagine the mind itself becoming eclipsed in the anxious endeavour to light upon some natural interpretation of the words. It is indeed a matter for notice that the Joshuaic miracle concerning the battle of Gibeon is not recorded in Hebrews xi., since here it might perhaps have been reasonably expected to have found a memorial niche. But even here again we must note that it is at the precise point (ver. 32) where this miracle should in order follow that the Apostle breaks off for want of time from further individual details, and proceeds to group his succeeding remarks in an accumulative form. The list, however, though copious, is at best but an incomplete one: no mention at all by name being made, for instance, of Elijah or Elisha, though their faith and fame were of the most renowned character. It is not so much an enumeration of the exploits performed by the patriarchs, as a testimony to the motive by which they were actuated.

There appears to be no special reason for making the book of Jasher solely responsible for the accuracy of the passage (Joshua

Digitized by Google

x. 13—15) because some additional account of the miracle is said to be found therein. Why may it not signify—"Is not the occurrence further rehearsed in the Book of Jasher?" etc., "Is it not there stated more fully?" The lamentation of David for Saul and Jonathan (1 Kings i.) must, if mere quotation create sole responsibility, be in like manner regarded by them as inserted from the same source, and consequently also regarded by them as of non-inspired authorship, and limited veracity. By the same rule also, those events in the Books of the Kings which are related as to be found in the Books of the Chronicles, are made to depend for their authenticity upon what may be said about them in the latter. For instance, an account of the ivory house which Ahab built is stated in 1 Kings xxii., as being written in the Books of the Chronicles. But in those books it is not mentioned at all. Is it therefore possessed of no independent authenticity in Kings, but only to be regarded as a pious fraud or myth? Such a course of reasoning if carried to its legitimate consequences, will be found to place the theories of plenary inspiration and direct revelation in a dilemma which must surprise many of its defenders. The sole idea of the writer of Joshua x. 12—15 amounts to this,—"For further particulars in confirmation of what is said here, see Book of Jasher." Of the entire account given us, one or other of three views must be taken. Either, 1, Joshua did not utter the words; 2, he uttered the words attributed to him, and there was no response; or, 3, the miracle in answer to his ejaculation did occur. If either the first or the second view be the correct one, then the interpolator did the best thing he could to defeat his own purpose, in adding ver. 14, his own sentiments, and so directing attention to the fraud. It would have been an absurdity if the whole story were a dream, to assert, as he there does, that no other instance of such a display had occurred, before or after, of Divine interference, since the destruction of Pharaoh's host. The overthrow of Sihon and Og, and the fall of Jericho, were of so highly recognised importance as to preclude the admission for ages after of the passage in question, while indeed every succeeding period would at the same time make its insertion more hazardous of acceptance. But what is yet far more to the point, the interpolation of a fable of so gigantic a character, as history (for the fact always preceded the poetic celebration of it), supposes a condition of laxity, and carelessness of editorial scrutiny and censorship, not only improbable, but the very contrary to known facts. Allow however the conclusion that the recorded miracle did take place, and the idea of abrupt insertion vanishes, and the narrative only occupies a position becomingly prominent and conspicuous. That such like appeals to the heavenly orb should have been

Digitized by Google

afterwards made by Agamemnon and others seems only to give additional support to the truth of Joshua's act, since the fame of it would spread far and wide, and suggest almost unconsciously a like phrase to others in giving utterance to their feelings under similar circumstances.

It is unfortunate to observe that in the consideration of the supernatural element of Scripture, a tendency is seen even among more orthodox commentators, to yield to the Rationalistic scruples of the age, and to accept a diminished construction of the thing asserted. The claims of the reported miracle are investigated, and their truth accepted, rather according to the measure of their dimensions than to the power of their moving cause, and the exigencies of the situation; and it is curious to notice how almost all writers who have advocated the truth of the Joshuaic miracle, have felt it incumbent upon them to attempt by way of defence some solution of its *modus operandi*, not inconsistent with natural laws, unduly overlooking the circumstance that the explanation of the miraculous by any known theory or system, divests it thereby of those qualifications essential to its constitution and existence. What marvel if He who created, harnessed and drove the fiery steeds, should for a brief moment restrain their career?

The final question may yet be asked,—Can those who reject the Bible narrative of the sun and moon as literally impossible, on account of the tremendous consequences attending its occurrence, consistently receive on the same ground of difficulty the atoning death of Christ as a fact? For if the cessation or suspension of the natural law of the solar system necessitates as a consequence the dislocation of the whole machinery, then by what means upon such theory could it be absolutely possible that He, the sun and centre of all systems, the cause by whom all things have their sustained existence, and upholding all by the word of His power, could actually divest Himself of His attributes, and pass away into Hades for a season?

Surely the consequences attending the first situation lose their prominence in the contemplation of the difficulties surrounding the latter; and yet as Christians we recognise and acknowledge the Lord's death as a reality, and are conscious at the same time also that nature managed to survive the crisis; and this brings in the harmonious parable, that at the overthrow of God's enemies, in the imperfectly developed and typical era, their destruction is completed by the suspended course of the light of day and night; in the latter and more advanced development of the eternal purposes, the overthrow of the adversary and his forces receives its decisive consummation in

Digitized by Google

the temporary suspension of the energies of the light and life of all worlds.

It may be observed, in closing, that the object of the previous remarks has been to endeavour to show the independent claim of the Scriptures to authenticity, irrespective of any incidental quotation or reference they might mention. But what was this book of Jasher? It would seem to have been a memorial roll or register, in which were inscribed the mighty acts of Jehovah. The יָהּ אֲשֶׁר (Jah-asher, =Jasher), a term interchangeable with the "I am," the ever upright and exalted one, in contradistinction to the heathen sun-god, Baal, or Baalzebub (*i.e.*, not the God destroying flies, but god of flies, in the sense of God of all flying, the flying God, the winged God, darting forward and piercing the darkness with his sting, beam or ray,—an attitude of their deity specially popular with the ancients: *i.e.*, the Sun-rise,[b] who was again overcome and dragged down every night to Sheol. Next, in a tranferred sense applied to the book itself, סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר (sepher hayyasher), book of righteousness. Then, book of the righteous, in allusion to the famous or upright ones in Israel, whose exploits were therein extolled in song, יָשִׁיר (Jasheer), to God.

We may not unreasonably conclude the book to have been a document devoted to the celebration of known facts, contemporaneous with Scripture, and of similar progressive construction, and from which portions, sometimes with their origin (like the books of Nathan, Gad, Idda, and others), acknowledged and sometimes not, were quoted, and their truth being confirmed by the inspired historians, they thus became incorporated and interwoven, like our subject-portion, as Scripture.

IN MEMORIAM.

The Late Rev. E. B. Elliott, M.A., Incumbent of St. Mark's, Kemp Town, Brighton, and Prebendary of Heytesbury.

THE close of the eighteenth century, an eventful epoch in the history of Europe, was in this country singularly marked by the birth of men whose names were destined to acquire notoriety,

---

[b] It was doubtless this which induced King Ahaziah (2 Kings i.) to send and inquire at the altar of Baal-zebub at Ekron (the etymology of both names are identical), in hope that some reviving ray or prospect of recovery might reach and rescue him from the bodily and mental distress into which he had sunk.

In the face of this the words of the Prophet Malachi, chap. iv. 1, have peculiar force, when, borrowing the heathen idea of torment to describe the con-

Digitized by Google

not only in English Universities and in the English Church, but wherever the English language is read, and wherever the interests of science, of literature, and of religion are held in esteem.

Many of these were enrolled amongst the members of Trinity College, Cambridge; and they conspired, in no ordinary degree, to enhance the reputation which that ancient foundation had already acquired. It is a somewhat invidious task to make a selection out of the numerous names of distinction which adorn the annals of Trinity College between the years 1808 and 1818, but those of Sedgwick, Blomfield, Whewell, Peacock, Waddington, Thirlwall, Julius Charles Hare, and the two Elliotts, will suffice as representatives of a body of men of whom the noblest collegiate institution in Europe might be justly proud.

The name of Edward Bishop Elliott is one with which the readers of the *Christian Observer*, by reason of his numerous and valuable contributions to this Journal, has been very familiar. Mr. Elliott was born in London, in the year 1793, shortly before the removal of his family to Clapham. Those of our readers whose memories carry them back to the commencement of the present century, and who are acquainted with the annals of the early Evangelical movement as delineated by the late Sir James Stephen and Mr. Colquhoun will experience no difficulty in realizing the scenes with which Mr. Elliott's youth was familiar, and with which the names of the Wilberforces, the Thorntons, and the Venns, of which last family his mother (a daughter of Henry Venn of Huddersfield) was an honoured member, are indissolubly associated.

Mr. Elliott's education, after his early school-days, was entrusted to private tutors, and it was not until after his admission to Trinity College in the year 1812, that he had the opportunity of giving any decisive indication of those remarkable powers which he afterwards displayed. The classical tripos had not yet come into existence, and he was thus denied the opportunity of exhibiting those high qualifications of which the Trinity fellowship examination is allowed by all competent judges to afford one of the most decisive tests. So slight was the expectation of success which Mr. Elliott himself entertained, that after the

---

suming of the wicked, he adds in ver. 2, "but unto you that believe on my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings" (rays.) In fact, to complete the matter, the same *Baal*-zebub was before he was risen *Beel*zebub, God of flies,—in the sense of tormenting, stinging, wounding: God of torment and dispenser of death. He was called by the Jews Beelze*bub*, god of filth, not in derision, but as signifying god of corruption (*i.e.*, author of corruption, destroyer of human life), who became like his worthy sire, Satan, transformed (every morning) into Baal-zebub, a messenger of light. He was probably represented and worshipped under the form of a winged fiery serpent or seraph.

Digitized by Google

examination was over, he had arranged to leave Cambridge without waiting for the announcement of the result; and none probably were more surprised than the subject of this notice, when Elliott and Whewell were announced as the only two successful candidates of the year in which they took their degrees.

Had Mr. Elliott determined to remain at Cambridge, it can scarcely be doubted that the highest distinctions which that University can confer would have been within his reach; his Seatonian Poems affording one, amongst many indications, of the versatility of his endowments. He resolved, however, to devote himself at once to the work of the ministry. For a short time he filled, at the request of friends, successive curacies, and amongst others that of Bidborough, near Tunbridge Wells, which then included the present parish of Southborough. In the spiritual welfare of this parish he continued to take a lively interest, and after the lapse of upwards of fifty years his name is there still held in affectionate remembrance.

In the year 1824 he accepted the College living of Tuxford, in the county of Nottingham. His married life here began. He was twice married: firstly, to Mary, daughter of John King, Esq., of Loxwood, Sussex; and secondly, to Harriette, daughter of Sir Richard Steele, Bart., of County Dublin. It was at Tuxford, also, that he formed an intimate friendship with the Rev. J. W. Brooks, then of East Retford, and subsequently Vicar of St. Mary's, Nottingham, whose attention had been much directed to the subject of prophecy; and when in the year 1837, in consequence of family circumstances, Mr. Elliott resigned that living and took up his abode at Torquay, he was urged by many friends to apply his vigorous intellect and his ripe scholarship to the solution of some of those problems which had so sorely perplexed and divided the Protestant school of Apocalyptic interpreters.

The first edition of the "Horæ Apocalypticæ," the great work in connection with which the name of Elliott has become a household word amongst English, American, and Continental theologians and Biblical students, appeared in the year 1844; the fifth and last edition, which received the careful and accurate revision of the highly gifted writer, appeared in 1862.

It would be altogether out of place in a brief sketch like the present to discuss the merits of a work read wherever the English language is known, and which may justly be described as a rich mine of erudition of the most varied character, to which those who adopt and those who reject the conclusions of the writer are almost equally indebted.

Digitized by Google

In the year 1853 Mr. Elliott accepted the incumbency of St. Mark's, Kemptown, Brighton, and subsequently, to the death, in the year 1865, of the Rev. H. V. Elliott, the founder of the Clergy Daughter School, so well known as St. Mary's Hall, he took an active part in carrying on the work to which his beloved and lamented brother had for many years devoted his powers and influence.

The larger portion of the works by which his name will be transmitted to posterity had been issued previously to the year in which he once more engaged in parochial duty. Amongst these we may make passing allusion to the various controversial works which owed their origin to the "Horæ Apocalypticæ," and more particularly to the extremely able strictures on some portions of the late Dean Alford's edition of the Greek Testament: also to the Warburtonian Lectures, which occupied a considerable portion of his attention during the years 1849—53.

Other occupations claimed the principal portion of Mr. Elliott's time subsequently to that period, but he still continued, in public as well as in private, to give evidence of the deep interest which he felt in every effort calculated to vindicate the Divine inspiration and to throw light upon the meaning of the Word of God, and more especially upon its prophetical portions.

In the year 1867 he edited, by Lady Aberdeen's request, a memoir of the fifth Earl of Aberdeen, better known as Lord Haddo, a short account of whom appeared from the pen of the Rev. H. V. Elliott in the May number of the *Christian Observer* in the year 1864; and from time to time he continued to send contributions to the pages of the same periodical.

Almost up to the very last Mr. Elliott's vigorous intellect retained its full power, and until within a few weeks of his death his natural energies of mind and body remained almost unimpaired. An attack upon the Johannine authorship and the Divine inspiration of the Apocalypse, in the October number of the *Edinburgh Review* of 1874, based upon M. Renan's "L' Antichrist," attracted his special attention, and called forth an elaborate refutation from his pen. "My Master's honour," he said, "is impugned;" and though frequently urged to desist, as a matter of caution, from his new and too arduous labours, he declared his unshaken resolution to "stand up for that honour" whilst he lived. Hence it was that, not content with a vigorous refutation of the positions maintained by the Edinburgh Reviewer, Mr. Elliott examined, in the course of those exhaustive letters which appeared in this periodical in the months of April, May, and June, the whole of Renan's Apocalyptic theory; those who may desire to meet with a succinct and conclusive demolition of

Digitized by Google

the Apocalyptic scheme of that attractive, but invidious and dangerous writer, will do well to study carefully this final contribution of the veteran scholar and divine to the subject which, up to the very last, continued to occupy so prominent a place in his thoughts.

In the removal from the Church militant of Edward Bishop Elliott, the universal Church of Christ on earth has sustained a heavy loss,—a loss doubly heavy because there are few, if any, left who are able to supply his place. He combined, in a very remarkable degree, an uncompromising attachment to what are distinctively known as Evangelical principles with unusual profundity of research, ripeness of scholarship, and keenness in controversial discussion.

Himself an attached member, as he was wont to express it, of "the Protestant Reformed Church of England," he loved to give the right hand of fellowship to members of the Moravian and other Protestant Churches in foreign lands, as well as to those at home, with whom, overlooking minor and non-essential differences in externals, he could claim fellowship in a living Head. "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," was emphatically his motto; and his countenance would glow with a special gladness when, by returned missionaries and home evangelists, tidings were brought of the advancement of the kingdom of Christ in all parts of the world.

High, however, as were his intellectual qualifications, great as was his reputation as a writer, and extensive as was the sphere within which his personal influence was exercised, we should signally fail to convey to our readers any just conception of his true character and disposition were we to restrict our notice to those of its phases which fell within the observation of the outer world. Those only who were admitted into close and constant intercourse with the subject of this sketch, were in a position to estimate at all adequately the largeness of his sympathies, the genuine benevolence of his heart, the tenderness of his affections, the love for little children, the glad and playful brightness which lit up his home-life, the unswerving integrity of his purpose, the child-like simplicity of his character, and the consistency of his whole career, as a humble and devoted servant of a crucified Saviour. Few men ever lived who were raised so entirely above the temptations of worldly ambition, or of vain-glory. None loved the truth more fervently for its own sake. None were animated by purer or more disinterested motives; none have been more regardless of the praise of men, or have sought more habitually to approve themselves in the sight of God.

"I had almost feared," said, on the day of his funeral, one

Digitized by Google

for some years associated with him as a valued coadjutor at St. Mark's, "to become acquainted with Mr. Elliott in private, having been so often disappointed by my knowledge of the home life of many great and public men. But when I had been for some time admitted to intimacy, I said to myself, 'Any one who wishes to know him in his truest and brightest character must know him in his own home, and in his own family.'"

Of his work at Brighton it is difficult in this brief sketch to give anything but a passing notice. When he came to St. Mark's, he found a new and unworked district. Now, schools for more than 400 children, a careful parochial organization, a Church Missionary Association (which has remitted largely to the Parent Society), and other institutions, tell of a long and loving ministry. His house, heart, and purse were open to all in need.

His interest in the young was a marked feature of his character; and as one of the most important branches of his ministerial work he organised a complete system of Bible Classes held in the various upper-class schools attending St. Mark's, for which he prepared with a care and earnestness surprising to those who looked on. "I will never give to the Lord of that which costs me nothing," he used to say, when the costliness of his preparations for these classes was the subject of remark.

Mr. Elliott was in London in the May of this year, and on the 4th attended the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society. He was at that time in possession of a more than ordinary amount of strength and energy; and he observed in the evening of the day on which the meeting was held, that he had been struck by the manifest indications of advancing life which he had observed in many of his contemporaries, whilst, he added, "*I* feel so young." Four days after his return to Brighton, and after an apparently slight fall, his physical strength began very sensibly to fail, and he never subsequently recovered it. To a friend who visited him on the 10th of July, he said, "I feel myself growing weaker every day, but God's strength always has been, and will to the end be sufficient for me." On another occasion, when reference was made to the all-sufficiency of the righteousness of Christ, he said, "Yes, it is Luther's 'new song:' 'Jesus, I am Thy sin! Jesus, Thou art my righteousness.'"

Amongst the hymns which from time to time were read to him by his own desire were the following: "Abide with me: fast falls the even-tide," "High Priest of our profession," "I lay my sins on Jesus," and "Jesus, refuge of my soul;" and amongst the chapters for which he most frequently asked were St. John xiv. and xvii.; and Apoc. vii., xxi., and xxii.

Digitized by Google

On Friday, July 30th, the end was seen to be fast approaching, and the difficulty of breathing became great. But prayer was made to God without ceasing by those to whom he was most dear that the painful struggle might not be prolonged. He in whose eyes "the death of His saints is precious," mercifully granted the request. It was in the afternoon, and immediately after the words were uttered by one of those who knelt at his side, "Into Thy hands we commend his spirit, for Thou hast redeemed him, O Lord, Thou God of truth," that his spirit passed from a world in which the faithful soldier of Christ had been long waiting for his Master's call. He now knows the fulness of the promise, "Where I am, there also shall my servant be."

CORRESPONDENCE.

"*Comforter or Advocate?*"

DEAR SIR,—The Revisers of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures are engaged in a work which must needs be of intense interest to the whole Church of Christ in England, and indeed wherever the Anglo-Saxon tongue is the vernacular. Whether it is expedient that the first revision should have proceeded so far without any portion of it having been submitted to public criticism, it is not our intention to consider; but we cannot but catch eagerly at any word or remark which may cast a gleam of light on what is being discussed within the walls of the Jerusalem Chamber. As Canon Perowne has intimated that the question at the head of this paper has been occupying the attention of the New Testament Company, will you admit into your pages a brief plea for retaining the Authorized Version of *Παράκλητος* in John xiv., xv., xvi.?

It is impossible for any one who from youth upwards has been accustomed to the phraseology of the English Version, and has learned to love and venerate it, to view with indifference the possible issue of this discussion. I plead for the retention of the word "Comforter" in the passages I have named, and will proceed to give my reasons.

It is generally agreed that *Παράκλητος* (one called in to help) is a word of so large an acceptation, that no single word in our language is its adequate representative. Among words, then, which can only approximate to a perfect rendering, we have to choose that one which on the whole best combines accuracy with comprehensiveness.

Digitized by Google

It is admitted, again, that the ideas conveyed by the words *comfort, advocacy,* and *exhortation,* are all included in *Παράκλητος* and its congeners. As an example of each meaning, take Matt. v. 4; 1 John ii. 1; Heb. iii. 13. These instances also show that this class of words cannot be uniformly represented by the same English equivalent in a translation of the New Testament.

Now in accomplishing so delicate a task as that of revising a version of which the very language possesses the charm of music for tens of thousands of its readers, we may surely lay it down that in cases where there is at least as much to be said in favour of the existing translation as there is for one proposed to be substituted for it, the question should be decided in favour of the former.

An appeal to the Vulgate is not conclusive, but it is remarkable that whereas its rendering in 1 John ii. 1, is "Advocatus," its rendering in St. John's Gospel is the simple Græcism, "Paracletus;" from which it may be inferred that in the latter case, "Advocatus" was felt to be inadequate. In Luke ii. 25, we have "Expectans consolationem Israel."

"Consolator," as the equivalent of *Παράκλητος* in the Gospel, is, as Bishop Pearson says, "of good antiquity," and he cites in its favour Hilary and Augustine.

If we regard the history of the two English words, "Comforter" and "Advocate," it would seem that the former is the more comprehensive of the two. While "Advocate" has ever signified one who pleads a cause, "Comforter" in former days meant not only one who administers consolation to the sorrowful, but in general one who imparts strength, aid, or support of any kind. Wickliffe's translation of the Bible supplies instances of this usage, and Hooker and Bacon use the word in the same wide sense. Nor should it be forgotten that the early Latin Christian writers used "advocare" in the sense of "comfort." Thus Tertullian, following the Septuagint, renders Is. lxi. 2, "To comfort all that mourn," by "Advocare lanquescentes."

But let us now turn to our Lord's farewell address to His Apostles, and particularly to John xiv. 16, a passage which is sometimes appealed to as settling the question in favour of adopting "Advocate:" "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you *another* Paraclete." It seems almost taken for granted by some commentators, that as our Lord is described in 1 John ii. 1, as "an Advocate with the Father," and as He says here, "*another*," we are bound to interpret the passage in the Gospel by the light of that in the Epistle. But is it not better to interpret it by its context, and by the meaning which it would most naturally convey to those to whom the discourse was addressed?

Digitized by Google

When our Lord uttered this promise, He had not yet offered Himself up as a Sacrifice for sin: He had not yet shed that blood, by right of which He was to qualify Himself to discharge the functions of High Priest, Intercessor, and Advocate with the Father. And, considering the ignorance of the Apostles at this time as to the nature of the mediatorial work which their Divine Master had come to perform, we find it hard to believe that a promise of "another Advocate" would convey to their minds any intelligible meaning, much more that it would yield appreciable consolation in view of His approaching departure. But the moment we substitute the word "Comforter," I feel it to be in exact harmony with the state of mind in which they then were, with the general tenor of Christ's address to them, and with the promise of "another Comforter." They were sorely needing comfort, and this departing Friend graciously presents Himself to them as their Comforter. He begins His discourse with, "Let not your heart be troubled;" and He continues it, tenderly bearing in mind that in the prospect of losing Him, "sorrow had filled their hearts." What, then, more truly consolatory than to hear Him say, "The Father shall give you *another* Comforter,"—another, who shall not merely encourage, help, and comfort you as I am now doing, but who shall not leave you as I am about to do; for He shall "abide with you for ever"?

But further: in the mind of the Jewish Church, one of the chief characteristics of the days of the Messiah, was that they would be days of consolation. Lightfoot, commenting on Luke ii. 25, says that "it is a question in the Talmud, how the Messiah, when He comes, will be designated; and some conclude from Lam. i. 16, that His name will be Menachem: *i.e.*, Comforter." Again: "The whole nation expected the consolation of Israel; so that nothing was more frequent among them than to swear by their desire of seeing this consolation." Now how well would the promise of another Comforter fall in with this national hope, fostered as it was by the language of the Septuagint, which repeatedly employs the verb παρακαλέω as the equivalent of "nacham" (comfort) in the great Messianic predictions of Isaiah: *e.g.*, Is. xlix. 13; lxi. 2, etc. We may imagine the Apostles, in their desolation of heart, saying one to another, "Is the consolation of Israel, for which our nation has so long been looking, about to vanish from our midst, leaving the darkness more intense than it was before? Were the days of the Messiah, which Prophets and Kings desired in past ages, to be limited to three brief years?" To these natural questionings, how direct and satisfying is the answer: "The Father shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever."

Digitized by Google

Let us not, however, be understood to dispute the accuracy of the rendering, "Advocate." We are well aware that on strictly etymological grounds, it may be successfully defended; and it undoubtedly sets forth one of the blessed offices of the Holy Ghost, as we learn from Rom. viii. 26, 27. But for the reasons above stated, I deprecate its adoption in John xiv., xv., xvi.

I remain, dear sir,
Faithfully your's,
F. F. Gor.

Sunderland Rectory.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mothers of Scripture. Second series. By Mrs. Goodwin Hatchard. London: Hatchards. 1875.—To influence the different classes of our people to love one another, and to love God, is the question of the day; for the interest of the Empire depends on the links of common interests and Christian sympathies binding together the different classes of the community. The severance of those links is the real danger that at the present day imperils the nation. Masters and men are in thousands standing aloof from each other, as if they had no common interests; and tens of thousands amongst us, in their neglect of public worship and disregard for all religion, are practically saying, "There is no God."

Every influence should be brought to bear to check this increasing evil; and though it may seem like the mouse nibbling at the rope that entangles the lion, amongst other means, mothers' meetings efficiently conducted prove a powerful agency for bringing about a better state of things amongst the working classes, both as regards the worship of God and their feelings towards those above them in social position. The ladies of England by these means can readily exercise Christian influence, naturally and without constraint; but the usefulness of them depends on the way in which they are conducted, and here it is that so many ladies find themselves hampered. They really yearn to undertake this labour of love, but are at a loss how they are to set about it,—how to work it up to its legitimate end in the permanent improvement of those who attend.

Mrs. Goodwin Hatchard has done good service by giving to the public her "Eight Years Experience of Mothers' Meetings," and also her "Mothers of Scripture," recently published. Besides excellent practical hints for conducting mothers' meetings, in the introduction, and a list of books suitable to be read at them, the book itself contains a simple exposition of the characters of the "Mothers of Scripture," with most practical lessons for the daily life of the

Digitized by Google

working mothers and wives of England. The teaching, though by no means superficial, is very plain; and at the same time there is an attractiveness, a cheeriness, as well as a depth of feeling that must interest even uneducated women. Whether the authoress describes Eve, or Ruth, or the virgin mother of our Lord, or Salome, the real woman is presented in all the individuality of her personal character. The volume ought to be in the hands of every lady who conducts, or who desires to conduct Mothers' Meetings.

The Parliamentary History of the Act of Uniformity, with Illustrations from Documents not hitherto published. By C. A. Swainson, D.D., Canon of Chichester,—Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. London: Bell. 1875.—We look upon this publication as a very timely one. It is a singular fact, that up to the present time many of the transactions of one of the most important and most interesting periods of our civil and Ecclesiastical history should have been involved in obscurity: many of them, we fear, are destined to remain in that obscurity. It is, however, obviously a most desirable thing that all those documents should be brought to light which may tend to elucidate the acts and the motives of those to whom we are indebted for the final revision of the English Prayer-book.

When judged by the ordinary rules applicable to similar cases, little doubt can, we think, be entertained that Canon Swainson's conclusions, as to the true intention of the Revisers of the English Prayer-book in 1661, with regard to the Ornaments Rubric, are fully sustained by the evidence which he has adduced. It is, of course, *possible* that the most distinguished divines of the English Church deliberately laid a trap for the Legislature, and that they succeeded in their manœuvre; but we think that, in the absence of evidence of the most conclusive character which would justify such a conclusion, the attempt to fasten this accusation upon a body of men,—amongst whom were found Cosin and Sanderson, Pearson and Sparrow, Frank and Thorndyke,—can only recoil upon the heads of their traducers.

It is quite *possible*, also, that a mistake was made in the framing of that Rubric; and that contrary to the intention of King, Lords, and Commons, and also to that of the two Houses of Convocation, a Rubric intended to sanction only the surplice may undesignedly have been so framed as to legalize the vestments of the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI. We agree with Canon Swainson, that should this prove to be the case, "we have a right to call upon Convocation and on Parliament,—or on Parliament, if Convocation should unhappily uphold the mistake of 1662,—to remedy that mistake, and make the law of the Church that which it was intended and understood to be." We heartily thank Canon Swainson for this very careful and elaborate contribution to the disentanglement of some of the numerous folds of the present Ritualistic controversy.

Genesis, with Notes. By the Rev. G. V. Garland, M.A. Parts I. and II. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875.—The object of this work, two parts of which have already appeared, is to account for the diversity of meaning given to the same Hebrew words: a diversity which the author ascribes in great measure to

Digitized by Google

the introduction of the vowel points. These points are discarded in the work before us; and the attempt is made to give that meaning to each Hebrew word which is most frequently assigned to it, either in the Septuagint or in the Authorized English Version of the Old Testament. The work, so far as it has already advanced, is executed with much care, and we have detected an unusually small number of typographical errors. We are constrained, however, to express our conviction, that although we regard this work as by no means without its use to the Biblical student, we do not regard the uniformity of rendering at which the author aims, as an object either practicable or desirable, in view of the different shades of meaning which belong to the same word in all languages, and the more than ordinary diversity of meaning which is attached to the same word in our own tongue. Very much, however, of the practical utility of Mr. Garland's contribution to our Biblical literature will depend, in our judgment, upon the character of the verbal index of reference which may be attached to it on its completion. We think, moreover, that he would have done well had he explained the object of his work more fully than he has done in the extremely "short preface" which appears upon the inside of the wrapper.

Spiritual Songs. By J. S. Monsell, LL.D., etc. Ninth thousand. London: Longmans. 1875.—This is a revised and enlarged edition of a volume of poems by the late Dr. Monsell, which has met with considerable acceptance: there is enough poetic feeling and expression in them to warrant this approval. We may add, too, that considering the source from which they have proceeded, they are not so much disfigured by sacramental error as might be anticipated; at the same time, as it was impossible to consider Dr. Monsell a safe guide in spiritual things during his life-time, we cannot unreservedly commend his volume of poems now. It is not, however, a matter of serious moment, as it is not probable that they will affect minds deeply, or have much more than an ephemeral existence.

The Bible Reader's Assistant. By the Rev. John Barr. A new edition, revised and enlarged. London: Blackie. 1875. This is a book which has been nearly fifty years before the public, and has gone through numerous editions. It partakes of the nature of a concordance, and also of a Bible dictionary; and would no doubt be found useful by unlearned persons, for whom it was originally intended. In small compass it contains a great deal of valuable information, and may safely be recommended. Some chronological and other tables are added to the present edition, which will be found very convenient. In the preface it is stated that the articles on places have been revised by the Rev. Dr. Porter.

Foundation Stones. By the Rev. Hely H. A. Smith. London: Hunt. 1875.—This volume is a collection of brief treatises which have been published by the author at different times, and now are presented in a single volume. Important questions affecting salvation are handled in a serious and reverential spirit. Mr. Smith staunchly upholds the doctrines of personal election and final perseverance, which he holds to be "old-fashioned truths, so old-fashioned as to be out of fashion;" but which he maintains have

Digitized by Google

been held by learned and godly men in all ages; are the decisively expressed opinions of many of the early Fathers, and notably of St. Augustine, and are in strict accordance with the teaching of our Church. The volume quite deserves careful and thoughtful perusal.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE period which has elapsed since our last word has been more uneventful than is usual, even at this recurring period of rest in a busy working world. The absence of political agitation has all but hushed the utterances of public men, and with the exception of the British Association there has not been any large gathering for religious or scientific objects, whose proceedings deserve notice. Two marine disasters have almost exclusively occupied public attention; one of them derived its especial importance from the circumstance of the Queen being on board her yacht when it came into collision with one of the many vessels swarming in the Solent: the other was a national calamity, for although unattended with loss of life it cost the country one of the finest vessels in the navy; fearful proof was given of the efficacy of the ram in naval warfare when the Vanguard succumbed in a dense fog to what seemed to be but a tap from the Iron Duke.

The quiet which has prevailed at home has for the most part reigned abroad. In France some excitement has been caused by a letter from an Orleanist partisan, calling upon the Comte de Chambord to resign his claims to the throne. This would seem a reasonable solution of a great difficulty which makes Monarchy in that country hopeless, but it is not likely to be accepted by the Legitimist party, and France must yet remain the prey of contending factions. The President has been constrained to dismiss the Admiral commanding the French fleet in the Mediterranean for an intemperate political letter: a sad proof of the want of discipline, which in its recent wars caused so much disaster to the country. In Spain the Alfonsists have gained some successes over the Carlists, and seem likely to drive them out of Catalonia. The most noteworthy incident of the month has been the insurrection in the Herzegovina, which has brought Turkey into serious collision with her Christian subjects. It will probably be ere long suppressed, but it has aroused diplomatic intervention in which Russia, and Austria especially, are taking an active part, and the result may be serious complications, if

Digitized by Google

not some element of a future war, imperiling still further the precarious existence of the Ottoman Porte. From China there has been received intelligence of a somewhat alarming character, but more recent telegrams lead to the hope that war between England and the Celestial Empire may yet be averted: still the relations of the two Empires are at the present unsatisfactory. In parts of our Indian Empire there have been serious floods, causing much devastation. Great excitement prevails there concerning the approaching visit of the Prince of Wales.

About thirty Germans went on a pilgrimage to Lourdes; it is somewhat remarkable that even thirty individuals could be found in a nation so intelligent as Germany to undertake this bootless errand. There has also been a Conference of old Catholics at Bonn; the most noticeable feature of this mission has been a disclaimer on the part of Dr. Dollinger of his belief in the Romish doctrine of purgatory. We could wish that this well meant attempt at unity had been furthered by a more complete renunciation of foolish errors, and more thorough conformity with the teaching of the Word of God.

By another unsatisfactory result of the principle of arbitration as a means of settling disputes, Delagoa Bay, in Africa, has been handed over to the Portuguese, and fresh encouragement has been given to slavery.

Favourable intelligence has been received from the Mission of the Church Missionary Society to the Eastern Coasts of Africa: a station to be called Frere Town has been established in a favourable position on the mainland, near Mombasa.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—

To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limited period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the reduced price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 11. NOVEMBER. [1875.

ON MISSIONS, AND THE BEST MODE OF CONDUCTING THEM.

MISSIONS are supposed by some to be a failure. One main source of error, leading to a misapprehension concerning them, usually springs from this: they are often spoken of as if they were the same everywhere; whereas in fact missions to the heathen are as diverse in character as the heathen to whom they are sent. In order to form a right judgment, it is indispensable that they should be viewed in this their two-fold aspect,—as missions to the barbarous, and, as distinct from them, to comparatively civilized peoples. There is again another class of missions, differing greatly from those to the civilized or uncivilized heathen, namely, those to the Mahomedans. In them the peculiar characteristics of the Moslem mind have to be considered; above all his creed, drawn from and based as it is upon the Old Testament; recognising the grand truth,—One true and living God, Maker of all things, and Judge of all men; abhorring all idolatry alike, whether heathen or that of the Greek and Romish Church. Missions in those fields, with their peculiar difficulties, must be weighed and looked at in a different light from those to the heathen, before their success or supposed failure can be measured.

Among barbarous and uncivilized races there is no religious system which can be opposed to Christianity, and few social barriers. The missionary moreover brings with him European civilization, with its attendant advantages and its marvels to the savage mind, ordinarily giving him a prestige and influence. But how different is the standpoint of the missionary in fields like China or India! There he has to contend with ancient systems of belief, revered by all that is respectable, foremost in all classes, and forming an essential part of the family life; while the missionary himself, as a foreigner and an alien, is viewed with disfavour. To place two fields of missions so different in one category, can only confuse and mislead.

Digitized by Google

Furthermore, an erroneous view held by some not unfriendly to Christian missions, must be noticed, which strikes at their root. It has been urged that the great truths of the Gospel of God should not be taught and proclaimed in the first instance to the savage, but that instruction in the arts of civilized life should be given as the first safe, and preliminary step in mission work. This is an entire misapprehension. We say this from considerable personal knowledge of the facts bearing on the question. The experience of all who have seen and known missionary labour amongst barbarous tribes, has proved that the savage, in his ignorance and degradation, is indifferent to the arts and usages of the civilized man. He does not appreciate them. Even clothing (except the one blanket for warmth in cold regions) is not desired by him, and it is certain that he is but very slightly affected and influenced by an acquaintance with arts or science. The industrial training must follow, not precede the Gospel teaching.

To act otherwise is to attempt to build without a foundation. Ever mindful of God's work in the heart, with its regenerating influence, the true labourer amongst uncivilized man perceives at the outset that it is essential to his success that the savage should have his mental powers and his affections called forth; that he should be so impressed and touched, that he shall be constrained to think and reflect; and that if he is to be raised above the mere animal, without desire or thought of anything higher than his present physical wants, it must be by an influence which shall bear upon his heart and mind; that without this he cannot be raised, and must remain a brutal, low savage.

The missionary finds, moreover, that there is nothing which can so touch and impress him, and as a consequence transform him into a thinking and reflecting being, as to lead him to recognise, and also to fear God, his Almighty Creator and Judge,—to view his Maker as holy and just and good, abhorring all evil, yet full of compassion and love to all His creatures in His beloved Son. Let this knowledge be implanted in the mind and heart, and there is a hold upon the untutored man which nothing else can give. Man is dealt with in his whole and true nature. Those dormant moral and higher intellectual powers are awakened with which God has endowed every man, however low he may be in the human scale. No mere knowledge of, or practice of civilized arts, can thus reach the heart and intellect, and elevate man into a reflecting being, teaching him to look beyond the present hour, and his animal gratifications.

It is demonstrable also from the history of all true missions, that it is this setting forth the Gospel which has proved itself to be the only successful course of action; and that wherever

Digitized by Google

this has not been tried, and philanthropic efforts for the civilization of the savage alone relied upon, they have signally failed.

But strongly as we hold this, and distinct as is our assurance that the simple preaching of the Gospel can alone command God's blessing, yet it is not less an error into which some have fallen, when they have urged that the missionary should limit himself exclusively to this duty of proclaiming the Gospel, esteeming this not his chief, but his one only work. All experience seems opposed to this course. No one can doubt, for example, that in the instance of the Metlakatlah Mission, Mr. Duncan's time and labours have been rightly employed; not alone as the evangelist, but also as the instructor of his people in all ordinary social, secular matters, in the schoolroom and in the workshop. This combination of spiritual and secular teaching is indispensable in all missions to savage races in their early stage.

This we apprehend to be equally true, whether the sphere of the missionary be amongst barbarous races or amongst partially civilized communities. In both he will find it indispensable to combine with his spiritual, subordinate secular duties, if he is to form his converts into a permanent Christian Church and community. One of his primary labours must be to endeavour to form their tongue into a written language,—a boon to their race beyond all price, rendering thereby God's Word accessible to them and to future generations. In the case of the more civilized peoples, as in India and China, the missionary may often be compelled to give much time and thought, with a view to future progress, to the bare study of the language,—to the compiling of grammars and dictionaries,—to preparing tracts and treatises,—to the training and education of his converts and their children, not in elementary, but in higher knowledge; this being absolutely necessary to fit them to become his helpers and assistants in his work of translation, and in all his duties.

It will be also obvious that to enable his people to stand their ground as a Christian community, they and their children must be mentally as well as morally raised; that without this they could not become a self-supporting, a living, and a growing Church.

While therefore he seeks and desires above all God's special blessing upon his spiritual labours,—and to those he gives the first place,—a missionary so circumstanced, is at the same time fully sensible that his subordinate secular task of training and education is not less genuine mission work, when he looks forward to the great and ultimate end of all missions,—the planting of a Christian Church,—a Church which may endure, expand, and fill the land to the glory of his Master's name. This great

Digitized by Google

end and purpose of missions is too often overlooked, and the views of friends narrowed to the consideration of the immediate effects of mission labour upon those who may first hear the Gospel preached. The building up of a Christian Church which may be a light to future generations is the great ultimate aim of Christian missions.

The missionary in India or China will therefore, like his brother missionaries in less civilized fields, find it absolutely necessary for the permanent establishment of his mission, as well as to extend his sphere of usefulness and influence, to enter upon secular educational work. He will seek to prepare some from among his people for the ministry, to stand in due time in his place. These men will require a higher education and training to secure the soundness and progress of the infant Church. The task of even a high education will then become a necessary and legitimate part of his work, when he looks forward to the great and ultimate end of his labours and sacrifices. And, just as the missionary amongst rude tribes secures, through the material benefits he confers, the opportunity of imparting Christian truth regularly and constantly to numbers who would not otherwise seek him or be accessible to him, so it is we apprehend with the missionary in India more especially. It is only through the means of education, with its attendant advantages, that he can obtain access to large sections of the people, especially to the youth of the influential classes, and induce them to receive his Christian teachings. Through no other channel can he be a missionary to them, and so fully carry out his Master's command —to preach the Gospel to every creature, high and low.

There is not then any essential distinction between the two cases. Educational institutions in India of a high character, like those of Dr. Duff of Calcutta, the Rev. T. Noble of Masulipatam, and of the Rev. J. Anderson of Madras, have secured an extended field for missionary labour, not to be obtained by any other means. They have acted on the surrounding society, as Industrial Institutions act on missions in uncivilized countries; in both the object of the missionary has been to bring all he could reach under the influence of a preached Gospel,—and both classes of labourers have seen it to be their duty to combine secular work with that which is directly spiritual, in order to give full efficacy to their missionary calling.

The object of this paper is then to point out the value, and more than that, the necessity for employing other agencies, without for one moment detracting from the paramount necessity of preaching Christ fully, faithfully, openly in the streets, in the highway, and from house to house; other modes of action in the mission fields, if missions are to be made permanent centres of light, and to diffuse the blessings of Christianity on all around.

Digitized by Google

For example: *it is necessary* to give to the savage man in North-west America and in Africa, in addition to the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, some acquaintance with industrial arts, and to endeavour to imbue him with the desire for social improvement, for decent clothing, and better dwellings. It is necessary to gather their youths into schools, and to train and educate them as Christians. In the case of the more civilized races,—as in India, China, and Japan, where there is a written language, *it is necessary* to give them God's Word in their own tongues, with other written instruction, and not to depend exclusively on oral teaching. For this end education is needful, which will at the same time elevate them and qualify them for the office of the ministry, and to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour; enabling them, both by their influence and example, to spread God's truth more fully and effectually. By education alone can a Christian Church be constituted and permanently established.

This is the view of Mission work taken by our more experienced missionaries.

Dr. Wilson, of Bombay, for instance, whilst he fully recognises the value of itinerant preaching, when intelligent, and effective, advocated at the Allahabad Conference,[a] after forty years of mission life, the use equally of other agencies.

"I have," he observes, "found it of much consequence to deliver courses of sermons and lectures. In connection with literary and scientific lectures, delivered I trust in a Christian spirit, I have sought to commend the truth of God to the attention of students and the educated classes. From the lectures and serial discourses here referred to, the blessing of God has not been withheld. Schools and colleges are certainly greatly auxiliary to the preaching of the Gospel, which is largely announced to their pupils from day to day by their missionary teachers and professors. We have to sow the heavenly seed 'beside all waters,' and diligently to seek and to dig for 'waters' beside which to 'sow.'"

The Church Missionary Intelligencer of January last (pages 16 and 17) thus summarizes Dr. Wilson's opinions:—

"Dr. Wilson, of Bombay, held that Missionary Institutions and Colleges were an indispensable portion of mission agency. He had used preaching; he had used the press; he had used vernacular schools; he had for forty years been connected with a high school and college, and rejoiced at it. This college had had its own direct fruits in the conversion and education for the Christian ministry and Christian agency of Parsees and Brahmins. A most distinguished medical graduate of the Bombay University, who had received his education at the Free Church College, had embraced Christianity, and so had others during the last few years."

[a] See Imámuddean's remarks: Allahabad Conference.

Digitized by Google

We have also the following recorded opinion of the Rev. J. Vaughan, of Calcutta.[b]

"When he arrived in India, he was most strongly opposed to missionary schools and colleges. Now, after seventeen years' close observation, he had arrived at the deliberate conviction that his first impressions were wrong. He held now that school-work was a most valuable and important part of missionary agency. He was not fitted for it himself; he thought it one of the hardest and most trying points of missionary labour. The Gospel was to be preached to *every creature*. If missionary labours were confined to street preaching, respectable natives would never hear the Gospel. He maintained that very direct results had flowed from education. He mixed much with the educated classes, and could testify to the value of educational agency upon their minds."[c]

Similar opinions are given by others, who have laboured long in our missions. From lengthened acquaintance with our elder missionaries, we can assert that there are few of this class who would not subscribe to Dr. Wilson's sentiment; that it is at once their duty and their privilege "to sow beside all waters," looking to the great Head of the Church, in His own time to grant the blessing and the increase, alike in bringing into the fold and in the building up and perfecting of His Church.

If those who declaim about failure of missions would draw the distinctions pointed out above between the different spheres or fields of missionary effort, the fallacy of their condemnation would be apparent. If they would fairly weigh results of missions to the uncivilized races, and not confound them with missions of a widely different character, they would find that not a shadow of doubt rests upon the fact of their most ample success. In the missions in West Africa, a Christian Church and community have been created out of the dregs of Negro barbarism and slavery, independent and almost entirely self-supporting; its native ministers well educated, and its Church taking its part in forwarding the Christianizing and civilizing of the tribes on its border; sending out from its ranks a native African bishop, with pure native pastors and Evangelists, to the Niger, and that region now constituted by law a Church of England Bishopric.

In New Zealand, the Maori, a bold and intelligent race, but long within this century wild savages and cannibals, have been so elevated and reclaimed, that members of this race take part as its representatives, and sit in the Parliament of the Colony. Whilst all acquainted with the Colony admit that the native

[b] *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, January, 1874.

[c] Mr. Dyson's letter to Mr. Mallet.

Digitized by Google

Maori ministry are held in high estimation. Not only in missionary records, but in other publications also, these facts are fully stated. In a recent number (July 3rd) of the *Illustrated London News*, where even photographs are given of the Maori representatives, and this significant circumstance is noted,—that "it was only in 1872 that the last cannibal died,"—showing at once how complete the success; and in how short a time the final triumph of Christian missions has been attained.

Whatever vicissitudes these missions have passed through, and whatever imperfections may in this early statge adhere and continue to exist in them, as in all human societies, nevertheless a broad and permanent basis has been laid, which has ensured the full and final triumph of Christianity and civilization amongst these races. Again in Madagascar, or the Wesleyan Fiji Mission; this latter mission, with those of the London Missionary Society in the Pacific, and those of New Zealand and Melanesia, form a base for the not remote Christianization and civilization of the whole of the Islands of the South Pacific; whilst the Church Missionary Society's missions in North-West America, as the Metlakatla Mission, are doing the same for the aboriginal tribes, and the mixed races of that part of the American Continent.

Our space will not admit of facts in detail; but we would challenge the fullest scrutiny into the results of these missions; and we are more than satisfied that if this be done, and this class of missions be kept in view, no question as to success or failure could ever arise in the mind of any one. To our judgment, a like conviction will follow, if we examine carefully into the results of missionary labours in the other class of missions: viz., those in India or China, as in similar partially civilized communities. Thus Christianity has to force its way amongst such semi-civilized people, against ancient and deep-rooted religions, forming part of the very life of the people; their natural institutions, moreover, so mixed up with their idolatrous creeds,—as Caste, for instance, in India,—as to oppose a barrier to the progress of the Christian faith which few can estimate. It is, we conceive, to the gradual removal and overthrow of these obstacles, through the general spread of Divine truth by the missionaries, and the enlightenment which follows, and the access thus secured to the understanding and conscience, that we must look, if we would rightly appreciate the work of missions in this second sphere of missionary labour.

If this guage of missionary success is applied, as it assuredly should be, to our missions in India, in lieu of failure, great and important results have already been achieved. It is admitted that wherever Christian truth has been disseminated, either

Digitized by Google

through God's written Word, or by education, or by preaching, there the ancient idolatrous systems are perceptibly losing ground, and their hold upon the mass of society is diminished. To what but to the light of Bible truth can we trace the rise of the Brahmo Sumaj of Bengal, with its repudiation of Hindu idolatry? We are well assured, from experience, that this must be the inevitable consequence. Wherever God's great and holy truths are promulgated, that is where missions are found; there false religions will lose their power and influence, and thus the way be opened to the Gospel of God. It is this fruit of missionary work which we affirm to be abundantly seen, which constitutes its success, and is the preliminary step to the full reception and profession of Christianity.

J. F. T.

DR. SWAINSON'S HISTORY OF THE CREEDS.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds: their Literary History; together with an Account of the Growth and Reception of the Sermon on the Faith, commonly called "The Creed of St. Athanasius." By C. A. Swainson, D.D., Canon of Chichester, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chichester; formerly Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. London: John Murray, 1875.

In our October number we reviewed that portion of Dr. Swainson's work which deals with the Apostles' Creed and the Creeds of the Eastern Church. There yet remains the portion which is devoted to the so-called Athanasian Creed. This occupies considerably more than half the volume. It is evidently the one which has had the largest share of the writer's interest, and on which he has bestowed the most labour; and the result has been a dissertation, which for learning and research has had no equal in our language on the same subject, since the publication of Waterland's well-known work. No one henceforward who desires to make himself competently acquainted with the history of the Athanasian Creed, so far as has hitherto been ascertained, or with the controversies respecting it, will be at liberty to neglect what Dr. Swainson has written.

The point to which Dr. Swainson's attention is specially directed is the date of the Creed; but intimately connected with this are other questions, such as, the country in which it originated, the language in which it was written, its reception,

Digitized by Google

its past use in the Church's service, and, last but not least in the author's account, the question of its continued use in the service of the Church of England.

With regard to the date of the Creed, or, as following Dr. Swainson's example, we shall ordinarily style it, "the Quicunque," Dr. Swainson states at the outset (c. xvi.) the conclusion at which he has arrived, and then proceeds, through several succeeding chapters, to adduce the evidence on which his conclusion is founded. He is persuaded that the Quicunque "was not known in its present form before the latter years of the eighth century." (P. 195.)[a]

The reader sets out therefore with the advantage of knowing from the first the point to which the author would conduct him. We will be equally frank. If, by being known in its present form, Dr. Swainson means *generally* known, and that without prejudice to the question whether it may or may not have existed, and have existed as a whole, in obscurity, or comparative obscurity, from an earlier period than the latter years of the eighth century, we are prepared to acquiesce; but if he denies its previous existence, or its previous existence in its completed form, we are constrained to say that the evidence which he adduces does not satisfy us.

Dr. Swainson begins by referring to the opinion once almost universally prevalent, that the author of the Quicunque was Athanasius. This, however, as early as the Reformation, had begun to be questioned. In the next century Vossius, influenced by historical considerations, expressed his belief that it was first put forth in the time of Pepin or Charlemagne;[b] while Ussher, writing five years later, conceived that he had discovered evidence of its existence at a much earlier date.

Ussher was led to this conclusion by two manuscript Psalters which he had met with in Sir Robert Cotton's library, the earlier of which, from the character of the pictures and of the handwriting, he judged to be not later than the time of Gregory I., that is, than the close of the sixth century. This is the MS. now known as the Utrecht Psalter, whose date has recently been the subject of so much controversy. As its recovery, after having been lost to the learned world from Ussher's time to the present, is mainly due to Dr. Swainson, we give in his own

---

[a] Towards the close of his book (p. 448) he removes the date to "between the years 860 and 870." Is it possible that "eighth" is a misprint for "ninth"? or had he changed his opinion as his work proceeded?

[b] "De Tribus Symbolis," Diss. ii.: "But in a posthumous piece he was content to say that the Creed could not be set higher than the year 600."—*Waterland on the Athanasian Creed*, ch. i.

Digitized by Google

words his account of the circumstances which led to its identification:—

"In 1871, with a view to the controversy which was impending with regard to the Quicunque, I was preparing materials for an edition of Waterland's celebrated treatise upon it, and endeavouring to identify the manuscripts which Waterland refers to. In the course of my inquiries I met with great attention and kindness from Mr. Henry Bradshaw, the distinguished Librarian of the University of Cambridge. He mentioned to me one day in the month of November, that he had discovered a notice of the Athanasian Creed of the seventh or eighth century. He led me to Professor Westwood's magnificent work on 'The miniatures and ornaments of Anglo-Saxon and Irish Manuscripts,' and showed me a drawing from a Utrecht Psalter and the accompanying letter-press. I examined the latter with avidity. I felt confident that Professor Westwood had discovered the long missing manuscript by which Usher had overthrown, as was thought, the theory of Vossius; but I wished to see once more what Usher had said before I gave vent to my delight. A few minutes were sufficient, and Mr. Bradshaw also was convinced. I mentioned the discovery in a little pamphlet which I put out on Nov. 30th of that year. The circumstance attracted attention. Through the liberality of Professor Jones, S. J. of St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, and the exertions of Professor Arntz, of the Seminary of Cuilemberg, near to Utrecht, a few coloured lithographs of the pages containing the Athanasian Creed were received in England in May, 1872, one of which I was enabled to deposit in the library of the University of Cambridge. They were followed by others of a slightly different impression, late in June or early in July. These attracted greater attention, for one was transmitted to the Record Office, and placed in the hands of Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, the distinguished Deputy Keeper of the Public Rolls, who rapidly formed an opinion on the lithograph similar to that of Archbishop Usher. A few days later this copy was produced in the Upper House of Convocation, where it received great attention. At a later period of the year the authorities of the University of Utrecht transmitted three photographs of the pages in question, of which I had the honour of receiving one. Increased attention was drawn to the manuscript by Sir Duffus Hardy, in a report which he submitted to Lord Romilly, the Master of the Rolls. It was with great regret that I found that the learned writer upheld his earlier opinion by arguments of a literary character, which I knew were untenable; and I waited, with some anxiety, the judgment of palæographers, whose experience had been gained rather among books than among charters. The interest in the subject waxed greater. Reference was made to this report at an excited meeting held in the spring of 1873; and at last, through the intervention of the Foreign Office, the Trustees of the British Museum obtained temporary possession of the precious volume. It was then examined by some of the most experienced librarians and palæographers in England. The result is, so far as

Digitized by Google

I am aware, that Sir Duffus Hardy stands alone of living authorities in his opinion. I believe that every other authority who has examined the volume, simply on artistic and palæographical principles, has come to an opinion similar to that which I have been compelled to form from the general contents of the volume. The manuscript is said by these gentlemen to be not earlier than the school of Charlemagne. The canons and capitulars of that Monarch, to which I have already drawn attention, throw great interest upon the manuscripts of the period, and help to set the question at rest." (Pp. 197, 198.)

The remainder of the chapter from which we quote is occupied in showing, in opposition to a recent publication, that even on internal considerations it is plain that Athanasius could not have been the author. We are quite of Dr. Swainson's opinion; while, at the same time, the *historical* reasons for doubting the Athanasian origin of the Creed are such, as to render any elaborate refutation of the contrary hypothesis on *internal* grounds almost superfluous.

If, indeed, internal considerations were of weight in determining the question of authorship, there would be much greater reason for attributing the Quicunque to either Augustine or Vincentius of Lerins, than to Athanasius. Dr. Swainson points out, in the course of chs. xvii. and xviii., a number of coincidences both in matter and in expression between the language of the Creed and the language of these writers, coincidences so remarkable as to make it in the highest degree probable that the author, whoever he was, must have been indebted either directly or indirectly to their works,—in those parts of the Creed which relate to the Trinity, to Augustine's; to Vincentius's, in those which relate to the Incarnation.[c]

Yet, after all, these coincidences are really of no account in enabling us to determine the author. The utmost that can be inferred from them is the probable limit of time on the earlier side, before which the Quicunque could not have been written. As to the author, we may as well say at once, that in the wide range which lies before us, and in the utter absence of trustworthy landmarks, to search for him is simply to waste one's time in idle guess-work. Waterland did but draw a bow at a venture when he fixed upon Hilary of Arles.

In ch. xix. Dr. Swainson passes in review the Rules of Faith found in Councils and Synods between 451 and 700; and he shows, we think successfully, as regards those of the Spanish

[c] Dr. Swainson gives, at p. 226, a summary of coincidences which he has remarked between the Quicunque and the writings of Augustine and of Vincentius. It is to be regretted that in this and in some other instances the quotations are not in the original language.

Digitized by Google

Churches, that there is no such similarity between their language and that of the Quicunque, as to make it probable that the Quicunque was known in Spain (at any rate was regarded as of authority) up to the later of these dates. Waterland, indeed, with Baronius and others, was persuaded that there are traces of the Quicunque in the first canon of the fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633). If the coincidences had been more minute than they are, it might still have been a question, though Waterland believed that he had already disposed of that, which of the two documents was the earlier. But in truth they are not sufficient to warrant the belief that either document had had an eye to the other.

The case of the Roman and other Italian Churches is much the same as that of the Spanish. There does not appear to be any sufficient evidence that the Quicunque was known to them, or at all events was recognised by them as of authority, during the period referred to. Appeals are made to the Formularies of Nicæa and Constantinople, to the Decrees of Ephesus, the Definitio Fidei of Chalcedon, to the writings of Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, and others, but not one word of reference to the Quicunque. Nor do we meet with coincidences of language so close as to warrant the belief that the Quicunque was silently influencing the terminology of the period. If it existed, it was not as yet extensively known.

Chapter xx. is devoted to manuscript collections of Canons and Constitutions, of which a considerable number are still extant. Many of these contain documents of the nature of Creeds, and some of them contain the Quicunque. It is in one of these manuscripts that we first come upon distinct and unequivocal traces of that document; though in Dr. Swainson's account the passages referred to are to be looked upon rather as having "furnished the lines on which the latter part of the Quicunque was framed," than as a portion of the Quicunque itself. (P. 265.)

The MS. to which we refer is well known in the controversy respecting the age of the Athanasian Creed, as the "Colbertine MS." Dr. Swainson usually designates it as the "Paris MS., 3836," its present number in the Bibliothéque Nationale. It is admitted on all hands to be of the eighth century; indeed, to employ Dr. Swainson's words, "the opinion is now nearly uniform, that it was written about the year 730." (P. 262.)

In this manuscript, between two documents, both, it should be remarked, of the nature of Confessions of Faith (the Definitio Fidei of Chalcedon, and the Creed of Pope Damasus), there is found a fragment, copied from an earlier MS., which the Scribe

Digitized by Google

who copied it prefaces with these words: "Hæc invini Treveris in uno libro Scriptum sic incipiente, Domini nostri Jesu Christi et reliqua, Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat." Then follows, with some variations (as though the author were here and there interweaving his own words with the words of a previously existing document), that part of the Quicunque which in our present copies is continuous with the twenty-ninth verse: "Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem, ut Incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat."

Here, then, we conceive, we have evidence of the existence of the Quicunque, not only in the early part of the eighth century (about 730, when the Paris MS. was written), but at an earlier date, apparently considerably earlier, when the Treves MS., of which the Paris MS. was a copy, was written. We say "considerably earlier," for the Treves MS. was mutilated, and had lost some of its leaves, a circumstance which seems to imply that it was already of some age. Assuming fifty years as the lowest number answering to this condition, the date of the Treves MS. cannot well be placed later than 680; and the Quicunque must be acknowledged to have been in existence at least as early as that period. Indeed, we must go back further still, for the fragment before us seems to be a portion of a sermon or exposition, in which the author, as we have said, was interweaving his own words with the words of a document already existing.

Dr. Swainson is singular in the view which he takes of the Treves fragment. He is confident that it was the prototype on which the latter part of the Quicunque was formed. Every other writer, we believe without exception, who has dealt with the subject, has regarded it as a portion of the Quicunque; a distinct proof therefore that the Quicunque was already in existence.[d] Which of the two hypotheses is the more probable, will be best determined by placing the document in question side by side with the corresponding portion of the Quicunque:—

Treves M.S.	Quicunque.
	Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem ut Incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.
. . . . . Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat.	
Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confitemur quia Dominus. . . . Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter et Homo est.	Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus et Homo est.

[d] In a paper forwarded in Feb., 1872, to the Bishop of Gloucester, as Secretary of a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the province of Canterbury, by three of the Cambridge Divinity Professors, of whom Dr. Swainson was one, the others being Professors Westcott and Lightfoot, the Treves fragment is recognised as a portion of the Quicunque.

Digitized by Google

Deus est de substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus, et Homo de substantia matris, in sæculo natus.	Deus est ex substantia Patris, ante sæcula genitus, et Homo est ex substantia matris, in sæculo natus.
Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo, ex anima rationabili et humana carne subsistens.	Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.
Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patri secundum humanitatem.	Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem.
Qui, licet Deus sit Homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.	Qui, licet Deus sit et Homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.
Unus autem, non ex eo quod sit in carne conversa Divinitas, sed quia est in Deo adsumpta dignanter Humanitas.	Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed adsumptione Humanitatis in Deum.
Unus Christus est, non confusione substantiæ sed unitate Personæ.	Unus omino, non confusione substantiæ sed unitate Personæ.
* * * *	Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita Deus et Homo unus est Christus.
Qui, secundum fidem nostram, passus et mortuus, ad inferna discendens.	Qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos.
Et die tertia resurrexit.	Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.
Adque ad cœlos ascendit.	Ascendit ad cœlos.
Ad dexteram Dei Patris sedet, sicut vobis in Simbulo traditum est.	Sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis.
Inde ad judicandos vivos et mortuos credimus et speramus Eum esse venturum.	Inde venturs est judicare vivos et mortuos.
Ad cujus adventum erunt omnes homines sine dubo in suis corporibus resurrecturi, et reddituri de factis propriis rationem.	Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem.
Ut qui bona egerunt eant in vitam æternam, qui mala in ignem æternum.	Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam æternam, qui vero mala in ignem æternum.
Hæc est fides sancta et Catholica quam omnes homo qui ad vitam æternam pervenire desiderat, scire integræ debet, et fideliter custodire.	Hæc est fides Catholica quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

Can any one doubt, who "has not an hypothesis to serve," to use an expression of Waterland's, that we have in the mutilated Treves MS. (beginning, it will be remarked, in the middle of what is now the 29th verse), the latter portion of the Quicunque, or that, if we had had the MS. complete, we should have found on the preceding page the earlier portion; in other words, that

Digitized by Google

we have distinct evidence of the existence of the Quicunque at and before the time when the Treves MS. was written, that is at the latest, at some time before the close of the seventh century?

There are in this MS. two or three important various readings; but we must not stop to dwell upon them. On one, the omission of verse 37, we may have occasion to remark by and by. With regard to the comparative absence of the "antithetical swing," "the parallelism which renders the Quicunque so well adapted for chanting," which Dr. Swainson is disposed to think favourable to his hypothesis, we would observe that it does not appear till we reach that part of the Quicunque which is expressed almost word for word in the terms of the Apostles' Creed. It cannot therefore furnish an argument against the previous existence of the fomulary in its present state.

The great importance of this document, the earliest distinct trace of the Quicunque extant, must be our apology for having devoted what might otherwise seem a disproportionate portion of our space to its consideration.

One other remark, however, remains to be added. Judging from the preface with which the Scribe who wrote the Paris MS., introduces the Treves document, "Hæc invini Treviris," etc., it would seem that that document was new to him. The Quicunque, though already in existence, and of sufficient importance to be associated with the Definitio Fidei of Chalcedon and the Creed of Pope Damasus, was evidently not generally or extensively known. It neither "formed part of the education of the ordinary clerk," nor was in use in the Church's service, at the beginning of the eighth century.

Dr. Swainson's next chapter (xxi.) brings before us another trace of the Quicunque. We have already met with the latter half of it at Treves; singularly enough we now stumble upon the earlier portion of it in England. Dr. Swainson does not suggest in this case, as in the preceding, that "we have the lines on which that earlier portion was formed."

This document is found in the profession of faith which, according to the custom of the age, Denebert, Bishop of Worcester, exhibited on his consecration. "I will expound," he says, "in a few words, the orthodox Catholic and Apostolic faith as I have learned it, *because it is written*: Whoever wishes to be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith. Now the Catholic faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity, neither confounding," etc. Thus the profession proceeds in the precise words of our present formulary, to the end of verse 6; then, omitting verses 7—20, it continues (ver. 21), "The Father is made of none, neither created

Digitized by Google

nor begotten," and so on to the end of verse 27, which closes that part of the Quicunque which treats of the Trinity.

Putting then the Treves fragment and the Worcester fragment together, we have by far the larger part of the document with which we are familiar. It will be observed, that the terms in which Denebert introduces his profession imply that the words which he uses were taken from a document already in existence, already of authority, and therefore already, probably, of some standing. Denebert was consecrated in 798.

A few years later (809), a notice of the Quicunque reaches us from another and more distant quarter. Certain Latin monks, who were established in a convent at Jerusalem, and who had been subjected to ill-usage for reciting the Nicene Creed with the Filioque clause, vindicate themselves in a letter to Pope Leo III., by appealing to the "Faith of Athanasius," as likewise affirming the procession from the Son. The "Faith of Athanasius" is a title which is met with on earlier occasions than this;* but as there were no less than four or five or even six several documents so designated, it is not clear from the title alone, that it was the Quicunque which was intended. In the present instance, however, the reference to the Filioque leaves scarcely the shadow of a doubt that it was the veritable Quicunque which the good monks had in view, especially as there is evidence, in other instances, that by this time the name of Athanasius had begun to be associated with it.

This letter then affords another important landmark in the history of our document.

The remainder of the chapter is occupied with a number of extracts, witnessing to the laborious and patient research of the author, from documents of various kinds, the result of which seems to be that even as late as towards the middle of the ninth century, the Quicunque, "though," says Dr. Swainson, "in existence, at least in part," was still far from having obtained extensive prevalence.[f] From this time however, it gradually made its way,

* One of these on which in all probability it is the Quicunque which is intended, is referred to in a "celebrated document which Pertz has edited from a MS., now at Munich, which Pertz assigns, apparently without any authority, to the year 802. It directs that inquiries shall be made 'How the clergy know the Psalms,' 'how they teach the faith to Catechumens,' 'how they teach the Lord's Prayer and the meaning of the Symbol.'. . . Then it proceeds, 'These are the things which all ecclesiastics are ordered to learn: (i.) The Catholic Faith of St. Athanasius, and all other things relating to the Faith. (ii.) The Apostles' Creed. (iii.) The Lord's Prayer.'" (Swainson, p. 287.) That the "Faith of the Holy Bishop Athanasius," which a Canon of the celebrated Council of Antrim, supposed to have been held in 670, required the clergy to learn, was the Quicunque, is too doubtful to rest upon. (Swainson, p. 240.)

[f] "In their books of Divine Offices neither Isidore of Seville (circ. A.D. 630), nor Walfrid Strabo (840), nor Rabanus Maurus (855), nor Amalarius (830),

Digitized by Google

till at length it came to be "used at *prime* generally north of the Alps, and was sung with alternate choirs." (P. 310.)

Chapter xxii. brings us to what is probably the earliest complete copy of the Quicunque now extant. It is contained in a MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, which, there seems no doubt, must have been written in the eighth century,[g] not improbably in the earlier part of it, though Dr. Swainson remarks, judging from the accuracy of the Latin, that "if the MS. is of the eighth century, it was written after the revival of learning under Charles the Great." (P. 320.) He transcribes the text, prefixing Muratori's very interesting account of the MS., and at the end of his volume he appends a fac-simile of the page which contains the first part of it.

We have here then an example of the Quicunque complete, at a date, on very high authority, not later than the eighth century. How reluctantly Dr. Swainson yields to this authority appears from the summary with which (after following up his account of the Ambrosian MS. with a number of references to other documents) he brings the chapter to a close.

"Our summary is this, that there are several collections of hymns and prayers and other formulæ (formularies?) earlier than the middle of the eighth century, but of these not one contains the Quicunque; that at some as yet undetermined period, after the middle of that century, the Quicunque begins to appear, but in a form, which, though slightly different from the received form, is yet sufficient to show that it was not yet accepted for public service; and when at last it appeared in Ireland, it appeared with the legend connected with it, that it had been composed at the Council of Nicæa, by Eusebius, Dionysius, and a third whose name was unknown." (P. 332.)

The legend of its having been composed at Nicæa appears also in the "great Bible at Venice, and in the illustration contained in the Utrecht Psalter."[h]

Chapters xxiii. and xxiv. contain much interesting information respecting the ancient Psalters, of which a great number of manuscripts are still extant, a circumstance which is accounted

---

makes any refereuce to the use of the Athanasian Creed in the Church. The order of Hatto (820) does not carry conviction to me, except of a local use." (P. 311.)

[g] Montfaucon "considered it of the eighth century, Lombardic character;" Muratori maintains that it must have been written before the time of Photius, earlier than the time of Charlemagne." Dr. Ceriani, the present librarian of the Ambrosian Library, assured Dr. Swainson that "he considered it to be of the eighth century." (P. 317.)

[h] A drawing, prefixed to the Quicunque, representing the Council.

Digitized by Google

for by the importance attached to the repetition of the Psalms "as the great act of devotion, and the great medium of intercession."[1]

At the end of these Psalters there are frequently appended the Canticles and other hymns which were used in the Church's service; in the later Psalters, often the Apostles' Creed and the Quicunque; but "the earliest Latin Psalters which have been brought forward do not contain either the Quicunque or the Te Deum, or the Gloria in excelsis, or the Apostles' Creed." In fact, "putting on one side the Utrecht Psalter," the date of which is controverted on other grounds, "there is not a single copy that was in existence before the time of Charlemagne, that contains the Athanasian Creed." "In, or at all events, after his time, the Psalters became numerous; and, as a rule, they contain the Canticles and this Creed. But they are almost entirely Gallican Psalters." "These Gallican Psalters almost invariably ascribe the Quicunque to Athanasius." (Pp. 379, 380.)

One of these Psalters, if its reputed age were not open to question, would be of special importance in connection with the Quicunque. It is the famous Golden Psalter, now in the Imperial Library at Vienna, which, on the authority of a copy of Latin verses on the first leaf, in which Charles, King of France, presents the MS. to Hadrian on his election to the Popedom, Waterland, after Lambecius, assigns to about A.D. 770; taking it for granted, that "Rex Carolus" stands for Charlemagne, and "Hadrianus" for Hadrian I. Other circumstances however throw doubt upon this supposition, and it has been suggested that the "Charles" may more probably have been Charles the Bald, who ascended the throne in 840 and died in 877, and the Pope, Hadrian II., who became Pope in 867. We do not venture therefore to lay the stress upon this MS. which Waterland does. Its testimony however can be dispensed with, as we have already had sufficient proof of the existence of the Quicunque at an earlier period than the earliest date assigned to it.

Chapters xxv., xxvi., and xxvii. carry us through the time of the Adoptionist Controversy, and contain interesting quotations from the speeches and writings of Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia, Alcuin, and other bishops, as well as of Charlemagne himself; which, while they touch repeatedly upon the subject-

[1] "During the Carlovingian era the faithful were instructed not to offer masses for the success of an expedition, or for the removal of evil, or for the repose of a soul, but they were bidden to repeat the Psalter so many times. Thus we have an order in the time of Pepin (A.D. 765), that a hundred Psalters should be sung for a bishop on his death. In 779, when there was a great famine, bishops were enjoined to sing three Psalters: one for the king, one for his army, one for the present trouble. In 810 there was again a famine, and every presbyter was enjoined to sing fifty Psalms each day." (P. 337.)

Digitized by Google

matter of the Quicunque, and appeal to various authorities, Athanasius in the number (p. 392), do not avail themselves of its language. Dr. Swainson concludes from this circumstance, and with reason, that as yet in the Western Church the Quicunque (we will add, though in existence) was not (generally) recognised as an authoritative document. "We have strong proof that neither Paulinus, nor Alcuin, nor Charlemagne, up to this time, knew anything of it." (P. 413.) It will be remembered that Mr. Ffoulkes, in a pamphlet which contributed much towards the revival of the controversy respecting the origin and age of the Quicunque, contended that he had discovered the long sought for author in Paulinus. The suggestion was eagerly welcomed, at the time when it was first propounded, by many who had no love for the Quicunque. But we much doubt whether it is still regarded as of any account, even by Mr. Ffoulkes himself.

We pass over the chapter devoted to Hincmar (ch. xxviii.), whose work (written about 850), "De una et non Trina Deitate," in reply to Godeschalk, contains sundry quotations from the Quicunque. Even these are not sufficient to satisfy Dr. Swainson that Hincmar was acquainted with the document as a whole. Dr. Swainson adheres to his hypothesis to the last moment. Nothing short of absolute certainty will convince him.

So we are brought at length (ch. xxix.) to another, and one of the most interesting of the documents connected with the controversy,—the Commentary which Waterland, after Muratori, ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus, but which Dr. Swainson more cautiously designates by the mark which the oldest known MS. bears in the catalogue of the Bodleian Library, "Junius 25." Besides this Oxford MS., ascribed by the present learned Librarian of the Bodleian to the early part of the ninth century, three others are known to exist,—one at Milan, one at Florence, and another, part of which however is wanting, discovered by Dr. Swainson himself, at Vienna. The Milan MS. contains interpolations which do not appear in the Bodleian and Florentine copies.

Whatever the dates of the manuscripts, however, the Commentary itself contains, besides other internal marks suggestive of its age, a note of time, which goes far towards defining the limit of date on the later side. Commenting upon the clause in verse 31; "Homo est ex substantia matris in sæculo natus," the writer observes, "Id est in isto sexto milliario in quo nunc sumus," from which the inference is obvious, that the Commentary must have been written at some time—it may have been a long time—before the year of the world 6,000; and this year, adjusted to the Christian era, and estimated by the chronology current in

Digitized by Google

the middle ages, would coincide with A.D. 800.[j] It would occupy too much of our space to go into the proof of this; the argument will be found in detail in a pamphlet to which Dr. Swainson refers, the title of which is given below.[k]

Dr. Swainson devotes an interesting "Excursus" to the consideration of this argument. We will give the conclusion at which he arrives in his own words, only premising that, as will be seen, he lays much stress on the distinction between the Milanese MS. with its interpolations, and the Oxford MS., which differs from it in being free from them:—

"Reviewing the whole subject of these expositions (*i.e.*, of this exposition in its two several texts), and keeping before my mind the fact that the Milanese recension quotes Alcuin twice, whereas the Oxford copy is free from these quotations, I cannot claim to have proved more than this: viz., that the Milanese copy must be more recent than Alcuin (Alcuin died, as we have already observed, in 804), while the Oxford recension *may have been earlier*. But I maintain also that the unquestioned acceptance of these words, 'Id est in isto sexto milliario in quo nunc sumus,' in the ninth century (he means by the writer who interpolated the passages from Alcuin, and still retained the 'In isto sexto milliario,' etc.), shows that the argument, that the exposition must have been originally composed in the eighth or seventh, is not conclusive. As the Commentary was used in the ninth century, so it may have been compiled of earlier materials in the ninth."

Yet if those earlier materials belong to a date earlier than the ninth century, we have all that the author of the pamphlet referred to contended for. He himself probably would not maintain that his argument is absolutely conclusive. He could not be absolutely certain of the date at which the writer of the Commentary would have placed the close of the world's sixth millennary; and it is possible that, as time advanced, those who were expecting the great millennium to begin when 6,000 years of the world's age should have been completed, adjusted their system of chronology so as to keep that epoch still in advance, of which the note in the preceding page would seem to be an instance. Still in the absence of proof to the contrary, enough

[j] It is right to say that Mr. Ffoulkes has since discovered a writer of the ninth century, Freculph, Bishop of Lisieux, who reckons the date of the Incarnation, A.M. 5129. According to this system, the close of the sixth millennary would coincide with A.D. 871, and the argument is so far weakened. But it is the only instance which we have had brought to our notice, or have met with, notwithstanding a careful search, of a chronology which makes the close of the sixth millennary coincide with a date later than A.D. 799.

[k] "The Athanasian Creed: Reasons for rejecting Mr. Ffoulkes' theory as to its Age and Author." Oxford: Parker; and 377, Strand, London.

Digitized by Google

has been shown and enough conceded to make the earlier date of the Commentary, in its uninterpolated form, highly probable.

Much earlier, however, than the year 800, we should not be disposed to place it, for this reason,—because a Commentary implies not only the pre-existence of the work commented upon (an obvious consideration, but not the less important to be borne in mind), but that it should have become of sufficient note, and have grown into sufficient esteem to demand such treatment; and this, whatever the actual date of the Quicunque itself, does not seem to have been the case till towards the latter years of the eighth century.

The text of the Quicunque, as it is to be collected from the Commentary, is not complete. It wants, on the whole, thirteen, or according to the text of the Milanese MS., twelve verses; and Dr. Swainson, while he "is willing to allow that in the earlier form (that is, as it is found in the Oxford and Florentine MSS., and in the Viennese fragment) it may be earlier,—much earlier than the year 800,"—still contends that we have as yet no evidence of its existence in its completed state. "It may have existed in two or more imperfect forms, but it was imperfect." "My own conviction," he says, "is that it did not contain the clauses which are omitted in the Commentary. I cannot conceive that it was possible for an expositor to have omitted to notice the very definite declarations of clauses 2, 11, 12, 21, 22, 23." (Pp. 431, 432.)

Yet on referring to the verses omitted, any one will see that, with the exception of the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd, there is no reason to wonder at the omission, supposing them to have been in the original document. The second verse, which indeed is found in the Milanese MS., is virtually included under the first, and is repeated *totidem verbis* in ver. 42. Verses 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, are simply repetitions of the same sentiment; and the comment on ver. 20, "In his tribus Personis non tres Deos, nec tres Dominos, sed his tribus, sicut jam supra dixi, unum Deum et unum Dominium confiteor," might well be intended to suffice for them all. In like manner, verses 26, 27, 28, scarcely needed further remark after what had been already said. On ver. 29, which introduces that part of the Quicunque which treats of the Incarnation, we might no doubt have expected some words of comment; yet that its absence is not implied by its having been passed over, is plain from the fact that the latter half of it is found in the Treves MS. The only remaining omission is that of verses 21—23, than which none certainly might be thought more likely to have been interpolated, seeing that ver. 24 follows naturally upon ver. 20, as though the one were continuous with the other; and moreover, the verses in question might well seem to require

Digitized by Google

a Commentary, and during the Processionist controversy would have demanded one. We felt this so strongly at one time, that we were ourselves disposed to regard them as an interpolation; yet in truth the absence of further reference to them may be sufficiently accounted for by the circumstance that they are virtually anticipated in what is said on ver. 5: "*Alia est enim Persona Patris:* quia Pater ingenitus est, eo quod a nullo est genitus. *Alia Persona Filii* quia Filius a Patre solo est genitus. *Alia Spiritus Sancti,* quia a Patre et Filio Spiritus Sanctus procedens est." Moreover, they are found *totidem verbis* in Denebert's Confession, not to speak of the Ambrosian MS., which contains the Quicunque complete, and which, as we have already seen, is by competent authorities, whom Dr. Swainson does not gainsay, referred to the eighth century.

But we have devoted more of our space than we could well afford to "Junius 25." Dr. Swainson of course rejects the hypothesis which Waterland is at pains to establish, that the author of the exposition was Venantius Fortunatus, and we confess that the arguments which Waterland adduces are too slender to sustain his conclusion.

One other document remains, and that of very special interest, —the now famous "Utrecht Psalter,"—at the end of which, among the hymns of the Church, is a complete copy of the Quicunque. We have already given Dr. Swainson's account of the discovery of this MS. after it had been lost to the world for so many years. The question which he discusses in the present chapter is its age. Archbishop Ussher had assigned it to the latter years of the sixth century; but the account which he gave of it, apart from palæographical considerations, of which we are incapable of forming an opinion, had conviaced us, long before the recent controversy arose, that its date must have been later considerably. He stated that it was preceded by a copy of the Apostles' Creed, complete as at the present day; a circumstance of which no other instance appears to be known earlier than the middle of the eighth century. It seems now agreed by most competent judges of palæography, that even this date is too early, and that it cannot well be placed earlier than the ninth. We give Dr. Swainson's opinion, to which we are quite prepared to assent, in his own words. After briefly referring to the reports of Professor Westwood and the Librarians of the British Museum upon the MS., he proceeds:—

"I think, however, that we may look to the contents of the book as helping us to fix the date; and I cannot close my eyes to the fact that whilst they resemble closely the contents of many Psalters of the ninth century, no volume has as yet been adduced of an earlier date than the year 795, which resembles it in this respect, and the

Digitized by Google

general accuracy of the text of the volume indicates a high state of education on the part of the penman. This would encourage us to attribute it to the school of Charles the Great, or Charles le Chauve. I feel, however, some hesitation as to the date of the titles. They evince far inferior scholarship. . . . . But there remains enough in the text of the volume to satisfy me that that text could not have been written before the year 800. Our knowledge of the usage of the Church in regard to the Canticles, the comparison of this part with the older Psalters, and especially with the original portion of Vespasian A. (a MS. in the British Museum), the completed Apostles' Creed in a book of devotion, the relegation of Ps. cli. to the end of the volume in a Gallican Psalter, all combine to remove from my mind every shadow of doubt on the subject." (Pp. 450, 451.)

We have now placed before our readers an account of the most important in the very large collection of materials bearing upon the age of the Quicunque which Dr. Swainson's industry has brought together. His conclusion is, that although portions of the Quicunque existed at a much earlier period, and are to be traced, some in one quarter, some in another, yet in its completed state it is not found till the latter part of the ninth century. "It is clear," he says, "that it was not known as a whole to Paulinus, nor to Alcuin, or Charlemagne, or Leo." (P. 445.)[1]

"The whole evidence seems to show that the Quicunque was completed in the province of Rheims, between the years 860 and 870, and that when completed it steadily and rapidly gained favour. It was attributed at once to the great Patriarch of Alexandria, and not merely did it eclipse the Rules of Faith which had been previously assigned to him, but by its intrinsic merits, by its antithetical swing, and by its fitness for chanting, it drove out all the verbose and laborious compilations of Charlemagne and the Councils." (P. 448.)

Our own conclusion, founded upon the evidence which Dr. Swainson has set before us, differs from his more or less on each of the three points specified in this quotation: the time when the Quicunque was completed, or, as we should prefer to express ourselves, when it was written; the time when it came to be regarded as of authority; the time when it was first associated with the name of Athanasius. We will however briefly recall to the memory of our readers the more salient landmarks which we have passed on our way in following the course of Dr. Swainson's researches.

And first, we must take leave to set aside, as highly precarious and improbable, Dr. Swainson's hypothesis that the Quicunque is

[1] Paulinus died 804; Charlemagne, 814; Alcuin, 804; Leo, 816.

Digitized by Google

made up of portions which previously existed independently of each other. If this were said merely of one or two words or clauses which might be thought to have been interpolated after the original draught was composed, there might be less difficulty in acquiescing; but when we find in the Confession of Denebert, what may be described roughly as the first half of our present document, and in the Treves MS. what may be described roughly as the latter half, the last mentioned being obviously a fragment severed from a preceding context, we require at least something in the shape of proof to convince us.

Beginning, then, with the date at which Dr. Swainson recognises the Quicunque as complete (860—870), we have it as a whole—

(1) In the famous Vienna Psalter, presented by Charles, King of France, to Pope Hadrian, on his accession to the Papal chair, which, though assigned by Waterland after Lambecius to the year 770, on the supposition that by Charles we are to understand Charlemagne, and by Hadrian, Hadrian I., is with more probability assigned to 867, the date of the accession of Hadrian II., in the reign of Charles the Bald.

(2) We have it, as a whole, in the Utrecht Psalter, of which Dr. Swainson, though he might be disposed to "attribute it to the school of Charles the Great, or Charles le Chauve," does not venture to say more than that he is satisfied that "the text," as distinct from the titles of the Psalms, "could not have been written before the year 800."

(3) It is quoted and referred to as a whole by the monks of the Latin Convent on Mount Olivet, as the Creed of St. Athanasius, in their letter to Leo III., A.D. 809. It has been urged that we have not sufficient proof that by the "Creed of St. Athanasius" was meant the Quicunque; and if the date had been earlier by half a century, there might have been weight in the objection. But by this time there is reason to believe not only that the Quicunque was in existence, but that it was frequently designated by this title.

(4) It is found as a whole in the Ambrosian MS., to which none of the three authorities whom Dr. Swainson quotes (Muratori, Montfaucon, Dr. Ceriani) assigns a date later than the eighth century. (Pp. 317, 321, 322.)

(5) It is found in part (a considerable portion of the part relating to the Trinity, sufficient to leave no doubt as to the existence of the remainder) in Denebert's Confession of Faith, A.D. 798. Moreover the manner in which it is introduced implies that Denebert was quoting from a previously existing document and one which he regarded as of authority: "It is written, Whosoever wishes to be saved," etc.

Digitized by Google

Can any one doubt, with these data before him, that the Quicunque was in existence, and that, as a whole, before the close (some years at least before the close) of the eighth century?

(6) Further we have it contained virtually as a whole in the Commentary, designated as "Junius 25," which Dr. Swainson allows may be "earlier,—possibly much earlier than the year 800." (P. 432.) And without pressing the "much earlier" to its utmost extent, we must remember that a Commentary implies the previous existence of the text commented upon, an existence of sufficient duration to allow of its acquiring estimation enough to suggest a Commentary.

(7) Then going back over a considerable interval, we have the Colbertine MS., the date of which is allowed to be about 730, containing the latter half of the Quicunque, and that as copied from an earlier document, itself not an original, but based upon a previously existing text. We are thus carried back to about the middle of the seventh century.

Thus then, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Quicunque was in existence about the middle of the 7th century: say between 650 and 670. And this is the earliest date which we can reach on external warranty. We cannot, with Waterland, by ascribing the Commentary in "Junius 25" to Venantius Fortunatus, reach 570. Dr. Swainson does not enter upon the subject of internal evidence. This, we confess, is to a considerable extent precarious. But yet there are certain characteristics in the document which, if they do not assist us positively in determining its date, have at least a negative significance. The Quicunque cannot have been written before the rise of the Arian, Macedonian, and Apollinarian Controversies, for it has distinct reference to each of these heresies: it cannot have been written before St. Augustine's writings were published, for its language is plainly Augustinian. Waterland argues that it must have been written before the Eutychian and Nestorian Controversies were rife, otherwise, in the one case, we should not have had the illustration "as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ," which after the Eutychian times the Catholics were shy of using, on account of the advantage taken of it by their opponents; and, in the other case, we should have had more distinct and pointed safeguards inserted against Nestorianism, especially the introduction of the term Θεοτόκος, or its Latin equivalent, which after Nestorian times was rarely omitted. We may add there is no trace either of the Monothelite or of the Adoptionist controversy. Of the Processionist there might seem to be an intimation, were it not that the Augustinian influence which is visible throughout is sufficient to account for the "et Filio" of verse 23.

Digitized by Google

reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ," is too remarkable to be passed over without notice. Either it would appear not to have had a place in the original work, but to have been interpolated at a time subsequent to the date of the document on which the Treves MS. was based, which yet would hardly have been likely after the Eutychian Controversy had arisen, or it may have had a place in the original, and have been omitted by the author of the sermon or paraphrase contained in the Treves MS., out of caution in respect of Eutychianism then formidable.

On the whole, we are not disposed to press the argument as to the date of the Quicunque drawn from internal considerations, though we are far from regarding it as of no account. We think it safest to rest upon the proof furnished by the external evidence above exhibited. For anything that appears to the contrary, the Quicunque may have been written before the Eutychian, or even the Nestorian Controversy was prevalent. But all that we venture to assert is, that it was in existence at the period we have specified,—the middle of the seventh century.

Even then it was regarded as of sufficient importance to be incorporated in a sermon, or made the text of a paraphrase. In the following century, perhaps about the middle of it, we meet with it as the subject of a Commentary; and at the close, we find it supplying the substance of a Bishop's Profession of Faith on his Consecration. Thus it would seem to have been gradually growing in estimation. But there is no proof that it was extensively known, and still less that it was extensively recognised as of authority, till towards the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth. About this time it begins to appear among the Hymns and Canticles at the end of Psalters, which would imply that it was coming into use in the Church's service; but yet only in that part of the Church in which the Gallican Psalter was accepted. Dr. Swainson doubts "whether there is a single Roman Psalter, unconnected with England, that contains it." (P. 380.)

"These Gallican Psalters almost invariably ascribe the Quicunque to Athanasius." (Ibid.) And this circumstance would seem to mark the time when Athanasius' name first came to be associated with it: for we have no earlier instance. The prestige of that name, together with the intrinsic characteristics to which Dr. Swainson refers,—"its antithetical swing and its fitness for chanting," and the service of which it was proved to be in the Filioque Controversy, speedily raised it to the important position which, for the last thousand years, it has held in the Western Church.

Digitized by Google

We say advisedly "in the Western Church:" for though it has been stated that "in the orthodox confession of the Eastern Church, put forth in the seventeenth century by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the Athanasian Creed is ascribed to Athanasius himself, and is inserted as such in the Horologium of the Eastern Church" (p. 477), yet it has never been authoritatively sanctioned by the Eastern Church. The Eastern Church, as Dr. Swainson shows, recognises but one Creed as of authority, the Constantinopolitan in its original, uninterpolated form. The Athanasian Creed, like the Apostles', is essentially a formulary of the West.

And to this indeed both its structure, and the language in which it was originally written plainly point.

As to its structure, it is really neither more nor less than an exposition or enlargement of those Articles of the Western Creed which relate to the Trinity and the Incarnation; the remaining Articles being added, for the most part, in the very words of the original.

As to the original language. This without question was Latin: for though various Greek MSS. exist, yet these are all of comparatively recent date; and what is more to the point, they vary from one another to such an extent that it is impossible they can be copies of one and the same original. Their variations can be accounted for only on the supposition of their being translations. While, on the other hand, the Latin MSS. have no other discrepancies than such as were to be expected in the text of a document which has been repeatedly transcribed.

We need not detain our readers on the German, French, and English versions, further than to mention that our present English version appears to have been made from a Greek text: Greek being no doubt supposed, by the compilers of our Prayer-book, to have been the original language.

Before the Reformation the Quicunque was recited in the English Church "daily at Prime; and it was said by Genebrard to be in the Horologies (which we now call Breviaries) of the Roman Church. Thus its use is universally acknowledged,—but it has not been otherwise definitely sanctioned." (P. 506.) Even in Western Christendom it does not stand upon the same authoritative basis as the Constantinopolitan Creed. At the Reformation its authority was acknowledged by most of the Protestant Churches, as by our own; but, if we mistake not, it is not at present recited publicly in the services of any of them.

Dr. Swainson's concluding chapter contains an account of what was attempted, but without success, in 1689, towards making such alterations in respect of the Quicunque, or of the Rubric regulating its use, as might satisfy persons who had scruples

Digitized by Google

about the so-called damnatory clauses, together with a valuable *résumé* of the proceedings in the similar and equally unsuccessful attempt made by the Convocations of both Provinces, within the last six years. He himself, in his place as a member of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, pleaded earnestly, and in his book still pleads, for the rejection of those clauses, together with a return to the usage of the Church of England antecedently to 1662, when the Quicunque, instead of being substituted in place of the Apostles' Creed on the days on which it was appointed to be said, was recited in addition to it.

We have no wish to enter upon a controversy which has recently been conducted with no ordinary degree of warmth. But we venture to offer the following considerations bearing on both sides of the question,—the result of much and patient thought,—considerations which have led us to modify to some extent the view which we ourselves formerly held and maintained.

On the one hand, we must not lose sight of the cardinal importance attached in Scripture to sound belief: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (St. Mark xvi. 16.) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (St. John iii. 36.)

It might be urged perhaps, that our Lord's words refer simply to the general belief in Himself as the Messiah, not to this or the other particular in the detail of Christian doctrine. But it will be remembered that His Apostles use language equally strong of particular truths. We need only refer, for example, to St. Paul's language directed against those who were corrupting the doctrine of Justification by Faith, in Gal. i. 6—9, and against those who were denying the truth of the resurrection, in 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, and 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; or to St. John's warnings, in reference to those who were denying the verity of our Lord's human nature, in 1 John iv. 2, 3; 2 John vi. 11,—warnings the more to be noted, as exhibited by that Apostle who was eminently the Apostle of love,—warnings which, however the world would call them uncharitable, were themselves the utterance of love, of love which arrays itself with the instinct of parental affection against those who would injure the objects of its regard.

It is true that many of the statements of the Athanasian Creed are abstruse, and beyond the comprehension of persons who have not made the subject a special study. But it is to be borne in mind that such also are the heterodox statements, to guard against which they have been introduced. They would not have been ventured upon, if heresy, by perverting the great fundamental truths to which they relate, had not constrained the

Digitized by Google

Church to define with precision what otherwise she would have preferred to leave undefined. "Every one of them" (that we may adopt the language employed by an eminent living divine, in reference to another formulary), "even if it is not so now, was once the negation of some existing error; not a mere imagination of what it might be necessary to counteract, but founded upon an actual experience of that necessity,—a protest against something which might be advanced on the side of heterodoxy and false religion, even because it had already been so advanced, and had wrought some serious breach in the unity and in the completeness of the faith once delivered to the saints." [m]

Thus, if the Creed ventures upon matters, some of which may well seem too high for human reach, it has done so under constraint. "It is the fault of heretics and blasphemers," to use the language of an older writer, "that we are forced to do things which ought not to be done, to climb heights on which no human foot ought to tread, to speak words which ought not to be spoken, to venture upon subjects which it is not permitted to handle; and when it behoves us to fulfil what is commanded by faith, and by faith alone,—to adore, that is, the Father, together with Him to worship the Son, and to abound in the Holy Ghost,—we are forced to stretch our feeble speech to things which are beyond the reach of speech, and by other men's fault are constrained to be guilty of a fault ourselves, insomuch that things which ought to have been religiously kept within our own breasts, are now imperilled by being made the subjects of human speech." [n]

These considerations are sufficient not only to justify, but to enhance the value of those abstruse statements with which the Creed deals, while at the same time they account for the strong language with which it guards them.

But the same considerations make it questionable, and more than questionable, whether it is well, in putting those statements into the mouths of an indiscriminate congregation, to couple them, when so put, with the denial of the salvability of such as are unable to accept them, the larger portion probably of those present being conscious that even to themselves they convey no

---

[m] The Rev. Dr. Vaughan. From a report which appeared in the public prints, of a sermon preached on the occasion of his "reading himself in" at Doncaster.

[n] "Compellimur hæreticorum et blasphemantium vitiis illicita agere, ardua scandere, ineffabilia eloqui, inconcessa præsumere. Et cum sola fide expleri quæ præcepta sunt oportet, adorare videlicet Patrem, et venerari cum Eo Filium, Sancto Spiritu abundare, cogimur sermonis nostri humilitatem ad ea quæ inenarrabilia sunt extendere, et in vitium vitio coarctamur alieno, ut quæ contineri religione mentium oportuissent, nunc in periculum humani eloquii proferantur." ("Hilar. de Trinitate ii.," § 2.)

Digitized by Google

ceding all the admiration to which the learned Professor is entitled, to dismiss every particle of fear on the subject, as nothing is more certain than this,—that no fact of science, fully ascertained, has ever yet been proved to be in opposition to any statement of Scripture rightly understood.

Moreover, Professor Tyndall is an accepted exponent of *Materialism;* and last year's meeting of the British Association gave him an opportunity of delivering his opinions before a most distinguished audience, which was not lost. With carefully weighed words he demonstrated that to the questions of the greatest and most vital importance concerning the happiness of mankind, science has virtually no answer to give,—that concerning the cause of all things, Materialism does not know and cannot know anything,—that although men, from an unquenchable desire in their nature, earnestly seek some sign, the oracle, like Baal of old, remains dumb: "It came to pass when midday was past, and they prophesied until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded."[a] The whole address indeed appears to partake very much of a sort of Janus-like character, at one moment leaning to simple Atheism, at another turned towards the "inscrutable mystery;" and "casting aside all the restrictions of Materialism," the learned Professor consoles himself with the thought that he is trespassing on a theme which he admits is "too great for me to handle, but which will assuredly be handled by the loftiest minds when you and I, like streaks of morning cloud, shall have melted into the infinite azure of the past." (P. 65.) In short, Professor Tyndall has virtually set up in the temple of science "an altar with this inscription, '*To the unknown God.*'" Such are the results of the scientific attainments in the nineteenth century, unrestrained by the fact that though we profess a revelation from on high, we are no better off than the polite Athenians with their numberless sects of philosophers, who had never heard of the one only and true God, though we may gather from the Apostles' words that there were some, even at Athens, who were feeling after Him who is "not far from everyone of us."

Nevertheless it is certain that Professor Tyndall is not a "Material Atheist," in the usual acceptation of that term, such as the Dean of Manchester charged him with being; for it gave him an opportunity, of which he eagerly availed himself in the preface to the authorized edition of his Belfast address, to deny the accusation,—feeling justified in terming the decanal statement as "standing conspicuous among the strange calumnies with

[a] 1 Kings xviii. 29.

Digitized by Google

which my words have been assailed." [b] And then he goes on to defend himself in the following words, which are sufficient to prove that there are times and seasons when he is conscious, like other men, of true vital religion being the better way; and that Materialism offers no satisfaction whatever to anyone who is really anxious in his search after truth.

"In connection with the charge of atheism, I would make one remark. Christian men are proved by their writings to have their hours of weakness and of doubt, as well as their hours of strength and of conviction; and men like myself share, in their own way, these variations of mood and tense..... I have noticed during years of self observation that it is not in hours of clearness and vigour that this doctrine (material atheism) commends itself to my mind; that in the presence of stronger and healthier thought it ever dissolves and disappears, as offering no solution of the mystery in which we dwell and of which we form a part." (Preface viii.)

We cannot, however, help thinking that both Tyndall and his colleague Professor Huxley would have done better for their fame, when challenged by the Presbytery of Belfast with "ignoring the existence of God and advocating pure and simple Materialism," if they had boldly met their opponents face to face, in place of showing the white feather; thus giving the Rev. Dr. Watts a right to say, in self-defence,

"Having thrown down the gauntlet on the platform of the Ulster Hall, in terms by no means complimentary, the Lecturer who tendered it *declined to meet*, face to face, on that same platform, those who accepted the challenge. There was, therefore, no alternative left to men who are set for the defence of religion and public morals, thus ruthlessly assailed, but to examine in some such way as the present the arguments advanced by these eminent atomic, molecular chiefs." [c]

One good result of Professor Tyndall's Belfast address, with his quasi-advocacy of Materialistic theories, has been to call forth a number of replies, the chief of which head our present article, in defence of revealed religion. Two of the number,—viz., "Problems of Faith," consisting of lectures to young men, delivered at the London Presbyterian College, by the Duke of

[b] Dean Cowie has made himself unhappily "conspicuous" in another direction, by his use of violent language against those who hold the same faith, which as a clergyman of the Church of England he is supposed to believe. In a sermon preached by him at St. John's, Hulme, June 20th, 1874, he is reported to have defined the religion of Protestants as more suitable to the "pothouse" than to a church, and condemned it as "the vulgar, blatant, ignorant Protestantism of newspaper writers and platform speakers"!

[c] "On the Hypothesis that Animals are Automata." By the Rev. Professor Watts, D.D., in "Problems of Faith," p. 60.

Digitized by Google

Argyll, Professsor Watts, and others, from which the above quotation is taken; and also a series of "Lectures on Science and Revelation: their Distinctive Provinces, with a review of the theories of Tyndall, Huxley, Darwin, and Herbert Spencer," by Professor Porter and others, delivered in one of the Presbyterian churches of Belfast,—we can more especially recommend to the notice of our readers, as fully equal to the occasion which called them forth, and proving that we have amongst us in the present day divines capable of meeting the Materialists on their own grounds, and of refuting the plagiarized objections which the speculative *savans* of all ages are wont to make against the truth of God's infallible Word.

In reply to Tyndall's final conclusion, that the whole process of *evolution* is the manifestation of a power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man, and that life on earth exists only by the operation of an insoluble mystery, Professor Porter justly observes,—

"This is enough for our purpose. Science shows that life is an entity, a power, apart from and above matter, but that in its essence it eludes the keen eye of the philosopher; that it cannot be discovered by the researches of the physiologist; that it will not emanate from the retort of the chemist, however skilfully he arrange and manipulate the elements of its physical basis: that, in fact, it lies hid amongst those sublime mysteries of nature which human wisdom utterly fails to penetrate, and which the infinite wisdom of the great Creator can alone reveal to the yearning spirit of His faithful creatures. *The whole teachings of science are, so far as they can go, in harmony with that simple but sublime record,* 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.'"[d]

In the same work Professor Wallace meets the lamentable objections which Tyndall has raised to the need of offering prayer to the Divine Creator of all things, showing, "without a trace of ill-temper, but with the passionless strength of a glacier," to use the objector's own metaphor, that there is a foundation in nature to render it *primâ facie* probable that God recognises the efficacy of prayer in man's relation with Himself. Hence he remarks what some persons are apt to forget, that "the main end of prayer, in our relation with God, is not the receiving the bountiful supplies of His providence, nor restoration from sickness, nor protection from calamities, nor length of days, but *the cultivation of a right state of mind towards God,—love, trust, reverence; and thus to enjoy His fellowship for evermore.*"[e]

---

[d] "Science and Revelation," p. 19.

[e] Professor Wallace on "Prayer in Relation to Natural Law," p. 46.

Digitized by Google

We have already noticed Tyndall's admission while repelling the charge of Atheism,—that it is only in his weaker hours that its awful doctrines have any hold upon his mind. We do not wonder at this; for Materialism, when strictly defined according to the tenets of its advocates, resolves itself into this,—Material things are the sole existences in the universe; properties manifested by matter the only attributes; no God above, no souls below; man but an aggregation of so many atoms of oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, phosphorus, etc., and their fellows; with no heavenly Father to whom he owes obedience; no Elder Brother who has bought him with the price of His precious blood, to whom he owes devotion; no Comforter to guide him in the right way, to whom he can draw nigh in every hour of need; no duty here, no prospect of happiness hereafter. Hence, says Dr. Hoppell, we "are right in concluding that Materialism denies the existence of God, of the Lord Jesus, of the Holy Spirit, of angels, of the spirits of just men made perfect, of the souls of men, of any to judge, to pray to, or to serve."[f]

In a similar strain Dr. Reichel points out how the denial of all possible *knowledge* of the existence of God, originally made by Comte in his "Positive Philosophy," has again made its appearance, though in a more covert form, in Professor Tyndall's late address as President of the British Association; for "speaking in the name of modern science, he has told us that Epicurus only anticipated modern discoveries when he said that the universe was produced by the mere fortuitous concourse of atoms falling through infinite space during infinite time." It is difficult to think how Professor Tyndall could have ventured upon such a monstrous theory in the presence of such an audience; but this is to be accounted for, as Dr. Reichel shows that a mind which could arrive at such conclusions and display them with so much complacency, is a mind which ignores both logic and mathematics, a mind trained in the school of mere experiment, not in the study, but only in the laboratory; and hence the highest mathematical intellects of the Association were compelled to disclaim and repudiate the venturesome theories of its President. And then Dr. Reichel points out with logical precision that the result of treating the new Materialistic doctrine comes to this: "Whether there be a God or not we cannot tell; but that in any case God is not wanted for the universe, since it has come into its present state through the combination, under their own laws, of its *primal atoms*."[g]

The practical tendency of some forms of scientific teaching in

---

[f] Dr. Hoppell's "Lecture on Materialism," p. 5.

[g] Dr. Reichel's "Sermon," p. 20.

Digitized by Google

the present day is to exclude all thoughts of the God of Nature and Revelation, and to avoid all recognition of Him in these matters, by substituting law and force and motion, development and evolution, necessary causation, etc., etc., in place of the will and power and wisdom of the Divine Creator. Hence when we find Professor Tyndall supporting Mr. Darwin's theory of Evolution, upon the ground "that it is just as noble a conception of the Deity to believe that He created a few original forms capable of self-development into other needful forms, as to believe that He required a fresh act of creation to supply the voids caused by the action of His laws,"[h] we cannot allow this to be a correct description of the system opposed to that of evolution. But the question in reality is one of *truth*, not of mere *sentiment*. And the author of "Cause and Effect" has proved, with the skill of a well-taught naturalist, that "the Darwinian theory of progressive variation and improvement in organized beings finds little support in the vegetable world. . . . No appreciable variation, even under continued cultivation, has taken place in the wheat grown in Egypt during the 3,000 years and more that its grains have laid in the folds of the cerecloth in which the mummies were enveloped: they are similar in every respect to what now grows in that country, and if it is a fact, as it has been asserted, that these ancient grains have been made to grow and produce the seven-eared corn of Egypt, the argument is considerably strengthened."[i]

Mr. Suckling Browne, in his "Divine Revelation, or Psuedo-Science," asks his readers to accept the following humorous illustration as a test of the soundness of the evolution theory, and contends that if the illustration be valid, and we think there is as much reason and logic in his argument as anything which has been evolved from the versatile mind of Mr. Darwin, "our business is done and our office performed," and the evolution doctrine must be pronounced, as the Scotch say, *not proven*. He supposes the case of an Irishman, who on being arraigned for an imputed breach of the law in the possession of a *gun*, put in a plea that was well calculated to establish his innocence and to secure him an honourable acquittal. "He appealed to the not yet sufficiently known and accepted science of Evolution. Loudly, and with fervid and heart-searching eloquence, the convict repelled the charge, and in terms and with energy that should have reached the judgment and secured the sympathy of the Court, averred that he had been the rightful owner of the gun, that it

---

[h] Tyndall's "Belfast Address," p. 54.

[i] "Cause and Effect," p. 7.

Digitized by Google

was found in his possession, *from the time it had been a very little pistol.*" [j]

Although according to Mr. Browne (p. 99) Darwin is said "not to read any work that does not uphold his hypothesis," we can hardly suppose the great teacher of the Evolution theory to be such a moral coward; but if it be true we can only regard it as one of the many reasons against our accepting such an untenable hypothesis. And in regard to another question, which is a natural outcome of the evolution doctrine,—as to how life first arose,—we have an amazing number of theories, all differing from one another, though all agreeing in this: viz., to reject or ignore the only book which is competent to speak on such a mysterious subject. We find some advocating the theory of *abiogenesis*, or spontaneous generation; others that of *biogenesis*, or life from life; Mr. Darwin selects the term *pangenesis;* Professor Huxley that of *protoplasm*. Mr. Herbert Spencer, as Mr. W. W. Smyth points out, "talks of *physiological units*, as molecular combinations which initiate the life of an organism and give it all the ancestral peculiarities of past ages." But inasmuch as these have definite times and terms of recurrence through many years and generations in the future, Mr. H. Spencer would do well to remember that "the fabled union of molecules, and the little definiteness which any arrangement shows in that feeble union, *will not support his hypothesis*. Equally unsupported by chemical and common sense is the theory that the *indefinite* molecular changes which colloids manifest can account for the 'definite combinations' in which life consists..... No man by taking thought, nor by accident, has ever been able to produce *spontaneously* that which is conceived to have arisen originally from salt water, powdered rocks, and sunshine!" [k]

When therefore we attempt to analyze the varied theories which have been propounded by these new apostles of humanity, whether it be the evolution of Darwin, the atoms of Tyndall, the protoplasm of Huxley, or the "unknowable" of Herbert Spencer, we are compelled to the conclusion that they have virtually agreed to banish the Creator from His works. They

---

[j] "Divine Revelation; or, Psuedo-Science?" An essay by R. G. Suckling Browne, B.D., p. 62. We cannot resist quoting a few words from the speech of the eloquent Irishman after having been found guilty of possessing the gun of another man, of which he argued that he had been the undoubted owner ever since it had been a *pistol*. "An' myself guilty is it avick! An' I the owner of the shooting animal, the poor baste! from whin 'twere a gorsoon of a pistol! No *grah* (good will) to jhoodge and jhoory! For sure there's small acquaintance wid the langidges, or wid Misther Euclid's *ailments* an' *logicals*, or, *agra*, wid Misther Dhurwin's *iwillootions!* Musha, no philomaths, them *spalpeens!* Och! an' 'tis a bad job intirely! Och! Och! Och! Och!" etc.

[k] "The Bible and the Doctrine of Evolution," by W. W. Smyth, p. 151.

Digitized by Google

surpass the heathen philosophers of old, who were unaided by a revelation from on high, for when beholding "the heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained," they assert, with more or less confidence, *these all made themselves.* Thus they confound God and man. By abolishing a future life they have made the present not only not worth living for, but in reality something like a curse in itself. They have thus imagined a place of torment worse than anything to be found in the Bible, and would if they could turn this world into that hell!

We regret our inability to say a word in favour of Mr. St. Clair's "Darwinism and Design; or, Creation by Evolution;" for however good his intentions may be in his hopeless endeavour to harmonize Darwinism and revelation, it is a manifest failure throughout. Let Evolutionists assert in any terms they choose that their system is proved, it is sufficient to say, in the name of common sense, and with firm courtesy, that is just the thing it is *not.*

The chief subjects of which Professor Tyndall undertook the defence in his address to the British Association, may be summarily described as the Atomic philosophy of the ancients, with some slight modifications by speculators in the present day; and the modern doctrine of Evolution, as popularized by Darwin and his numerous disciples.

Although the Latin poet Lucretius is commonly credited with the theory that once on a time there was a fortuitous concourse of atoms who in some unexplained manner took it into their heads to become Creator, and thus to found the world in which we dwell, there is no doubt that he took the idea from Epicurus, who lived more than two centuries before, as he in his turn received it from Democritus, who had preceded him by nearly the same amount of time. It is doubted even whether Democritus did not get the idea from a still earlier source: viz., one Moschus, a Phœnician, who is supposed to have caught the idea in the course of his long travels in Asia and Egypt.[1] Whether this

[1] We can scarcely think that Moschus could have learnt the idea of atoms being the founders of the universe from anything he met with in Egypt. For in that wonderful book entitled the "Ritual of the Dead," which is certainly earlier than the Pentateuch, we have a full account of the cosmological ideas current amongst the ancient Egyptians. There we may find a far sounder philosophy than can be gathered from the writings of Democritus, such as the expression in chapter xvii. on the Egyptian faith, "I am the great God, creating Himself," though mixed with such absurd ideas as are to be found in chap. liv., "I am the egg of the great Cackler. I have watched this great egg which Jeb has prepared for the earth."

Another strange mistake of Professor Tyndall, which proves him to be rather a tyro in the study of the Atomic philosophy, is to be found in his speaking of "Empedocles as having *noticed a gap* in the doctrine of Democritus"

Digitized by Google

was so or not is immaterial, it is to Democritus, who had enlarged and improved the doctrine which he had received from his contemporary and teacher Leucippus (whom Tyndall ignores altogether), that we must look for a correct definition of the principles of the Atomic philosophy as understood by the ancients, when speculating upon what Lucretius subsequently called the "First Beginnings." These principles may be briefly described as follows:—(1) From nothing comes nothing; nothing that exists can be destroyed; all changes are due to the combination and separation of molecules. (2) Nothing happens by chance; every occurrence has its cause, from which it follows by necessity. (3) The only existing things are the atoms and empty space, all else is mere opinion. (4) The atoms are infinite in number and infinitely various in form; they strike together, and the lateral motions and whirlings which thus arise are the beginnings of worlds. (5) The varieties of all things depend upon the varieties of their atoms, in number, size, and aggregation. (6) The soul consists of fine, smooth, round atoms, like those of fire. These are the most mobile of all: they interpenetrate the whole body, and in their motions the phenomena of life may be considered to arise.—Such were the principles enunciated by the Atomic philosophers, though as regards what Tyndall terms "that great enigma, the exquisite adaptation of one part of an organism to another part and to the construction of the human body," Democritus made no attempt to solve that problem.

It is a curious fact to observe how the first principle enunciated by Democritus, that "from nothing comes nothing," has been taken up by those who seem to be proud of being the revivers of the Atomic philosophy in the present day. For thus taught Professor Oken, of Zurich, at the beginning of this century, when speculating upon the *origin of man*:—

"The highest mathematical idea on the principle of all mathematics is that Zero = O. Zero is itself nothing. Mathematics is based upon nothing, and consequently arises out of nothing. The eternal is the nothing of nature.[m] *There exists nothing but nothing;* nothing but the Eternal. Man is God wholly manifested; God has become man; Zero has become +. For God to become real He must appear under the form of a sphere; God is a rotating globe;

(p. 5). Whereas Empedocles was at the height of his fame B.C. 444, when Democritus was sixteen years old, and who only became addicted to philosophy after his extensive travels in Egypt, Chaldæa, and other countries: dying B.C. 357.

[m] This teaching appears to agree with the idea expressed by Mr. Wake in his paper read at the British Association of 1871 on "Man and the Ape," when he said that God was nature, and that nature was an organic whole; that man was the natural result of its revolution, and that every part of nature had been evolved!

Digitized by Google

the world is God rotating. Everything that is is immaterial; self-consciousness is a living ellipse. Physical philosophy has to portray the first period of the world's development *out of nothing;* how the elements and heavenly bodies originated, in what method, by self-evolution into higher and manifold forms, they separated into minerals, became finally organic, and in man attained to self-consciousness. There are two kinds of generation in the world,—the creation proper, and the propagation that is consequent thereon; consequently no organism has been created of larger size than an infusorial point. No organism is nor ever has been created which is not microscopic. Whatever is larger has not been created, but developed: man has not been created, but developed. As the human body has been formed by the extreme separation of the mucous mass, so must the human mind be a separation, a memberment of infusorial sensation!"

To return, however, to the philosophy of Democritus, whom Lange, in his "History of Materialism," considers to have been so badly treated by his followers and copyists that scarcely anything of him remains but the name of "the Laughing Philosopher." Lange speaks of the high opinion entertained of him by Bacon, who rated him far higher than either Plato or Aristotle, notwithstanding their philosophy was "noised and celebrated in the schools, amid the din and pomp of professors." And at this we need not be surprised, considering how the former, in his "Banquet," describes the human race to have consisted of three kinds of beings,—male and female as now, and a third which combined the nature of both; the male kind being the produce originally of the *sun*, the female of the *earth*, and that which partook of the other two, of the *moon!!!* And so Aristotle, in his "De Generatione Animalium," seems to have grave doubts on his mind whether the human race crawled out of the earth as *worms* or came out as *eggs!* He affirmed, moreover, that the distinction between man and the lower animals consisted in this,—that in the former only was there any pulsation of the heart; that the left side of the body was colder than the right; that men have more teeth than women; and that there is an *empty space* at the back of every man's head!!!

Four centuries after the death of Democritus Lucretius wrote his poem "On the Nature of Things," in which he developed with extraordinary ardour the Atomic philosophy, affirming that the mechanical shock of atoms was sufficient to account for the existence of all things, and combating the teleological argument with great vigour, by denying that the constitution of nature has in any way been determined by intelligent design. It might have been well if Professor Tyndall in his admiration for the Atomic philosophy, had not overlooked the teaching of a contemporary of Lucretius, who certainly stands first in point of

Digitized by Google

intellect amongst the Roman philosophers of that or of any other age who were without the blessings of revelation. "The man," says Cicero, "who believes that this world was made by a fortuitous concourse of atoms, will believe that if a countless number of the letters of the alphabet were thrown into some place, from these letters, shaken out on to the ground, there can be formed the "Annals of Ennius," arranged in such order as to be read continuously." [n]

To show how unwilling Professor Tyndall is to admit the force of the argument from teleology, in reply to a friend who once said to him, "Did I not believe that an Intelligence is at the heart of things my life on earth would be intolerable," he makes this chilling remark, "The utterer of these words is rendered more noble by the fact that it was the need of ethical harmony here, and not the thought of personal profit hereafter, that prompted his observation." (P. 7.) Consequently Tyndall can adduce with truth the fact of Christian philosophers being led away by the attractions of the Atomic philosophy, such as Gassendi in the 14th century and Giordiano Bruno in the 16th; [o] and asserts that "the Atomic doctrine, in whole or in part, was entertained by Bacon, Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Newton, Boyle, and their successors, until the chemical law of multiple proportions enabled Dalton to confer upon it an entirely new significance." [p] And then he boasts that though "there are secessions from the theory it still stands firm," affirming that "Sir William Thomson has sought to determine the size of the atoms, or rather to fix the limits between which their sizes lie;" and adding that "it may be doubted whether, wanting this fundamental conception, a theory of the material universe is capable of scientific statement." (P. 27.)

Passing by this side-blow at the Mosaic cosmogony, which stands firm and will continue so to do, notwithstanding the animus of its puny assailants, like Professor Huxley in his Lay Sermon to the Clergy at Sion College, or Goodwin in his article on that subject in the notorious *Essays and Reviews*,—whereby they have only exposed their incompetence to handle subjects

---

[n] Cicero, "De Naturâ Deorum, ii. 37.

[o] Tyndall observes of Gassendi, who adopted the principle that every change resided in matter: "Thus this bold ecclesiastic, without incurring the censure of the Church or the world, *contrives to outstrip Mr. Darwin.*" (P. 25.)

[p] Oxford granted a Doctor's degree to the Quaker Dalton for his supposed discovery of the Neo-Atomic philosophy, which the President of the British Association, at Dundee, in 1867, declared was "a mistake from beginning to end;" a remark which serves to explain what Tyndall says of Dalton in his "Notes on Light,"—that "he could only distinguish by their form ripe *red* cherries from the *green* leaves of the tree. The defect is called colour blindness, or *Daltonism.*" (P. 41.)

Digitized by Google

of which they are totally ignorant, for it is impossible to suppose any one of them to be acquainted with the language in which Moses wrote the cosmogony of the Bible,—Professor Tyndall might have remembered the weighty words which this same Sir William Thomson, his predecessor in the Presidential chair, only three years before had addressed to the British Association at Edinburgh:—

"I feel," he says, "profoundly convinced that *the argument of design has been greatly too much lost sight of in recent zoological researches.* Overwhelmingly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie all around us, and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing to us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living beings depend on one ever-acting Creator and Ruler."

A similar remark may be made concerning Professor Clerk Maxwell, to whom Tyndall refers as "illustrating the present hold of the Atomic doctrine upon the foremost scientific minds," by his discourse at Bradford in 1874; for he justly declares that

"No theory of Evolution can be formed to account for the similarity of molecules, for evolution necessarily implies continuous change, and the molecule is incapable of growth or decay, of generation or discussion. . . . Science is incompetent to reason upon the creation of matter itself out of nothing. We have reached the utmost limit of our thinking faculties when we have admitted that because matter cannot be eternal and self-existent it must have been created. . . . The molecules continue this day as they were created, perfect in number, measure, and weight; and from the ineffaceable character impressed on them we may learn that those aspirations after accuracy in measurement, truth in statement, and justice in action, which we reckon among our noblest attributes as men, are ours because they are the essential constituents of the image of Him who in the beginning created not only the heaven and the earth, but the materials of which heaven and earth consist."

Contrast such teaching on the subject of *Evolution* with that of the school to which Tyndall belongs, and which may be summarily expressed in the words, which he quotes with approval, of one of its leaders, as "the belief that life under all its forms has arisen by an unbroken evolution and through the instrumentality of what are called natural causes."[q]

---

[q] "Principles of Psychology," vol. i., p. 465, by Herbert Spencer, whom some regard as the greatest thinker of the age, and whose religion is expressed in the following formula: "I don't affirm there is no God; I am simply between the two statements. Some say there is a God, some say there is not: I only say *I am not aware of it.*" This will scarcely exempt him from the censure of the Psalmist: "The fool has said in his heart there is no *God;*" for the word

Digitized by Google

If the doctrine of the ancient Atomic philosophers conflicted with the belief in a supreme intelligent Creator of all things, still more must that of Evolution conflict with the statement of Scripture, that "God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind." (Gen. i. 25.) The doctrine of Evolution, as first explained by De Maillet, Tyndall tells us, has been recently "brought into notice by Professor Huxley, as one who had a notion of the modifiability of living forms;" likewise by "the celebrated *Lamarck*, who produced so profound an impression on the public mind through the vigorous exposition of his views by the author of "Vestiges of Creation;" and notably by Dr. Erasmus Darwin, "the grandfather and pioneer" of his more illustrious namesake, whom he terms "the most terrible of antagonists," and whom he so far idolizes as to induce him to describe Mr. Charles Darwin in the following eulogistic strains:—

"Accomplished naturalists have levelled heavy and sustained criticisms against him, not always with the view of fairly weighing his theory, but with the express intention of exposing its weak points only. This does not irritate him. He treats every objection with a soberness and thoroughness which even Bishop Butler might be proud to imitate, surrounding each fact with its appropriate detail, placing it in its proper relations, and usually giving it a significance which, as long as it was kept isolated, failed to appear. This is done without a trace of ill-temper. He moves over the subject with the passionless strength of a glacier, and the grinding of the rocks is not always without a counterpart in the logical pulverization of the objector." (P. 44.)

As this is a favourable specimen of the self-satisfied way in which the sceptical school are in the habit of lauding each other, as well as of noticing their opponents, we trust we shall be able to show some reasons for declining to receive the Darwinian hypothesis of Evolution, which has bewitched so many of the claimants to wisdom in the present day, without betraying a trace of that "ill-temper," freedom from which Professor Tyndall places so complacently to the credit of his speculating friend. And in order to do this fairly we must place before our readers the very words of those masters, such as De Maillet and Lamarck, from whom Tyndall admits that Darwin has learnt his trade.[r]

---

used in Psalms xiv. 1 and liii. 1 is *Elohim*, denoting as the learned Jews teach, the *Trinity* who in the beginning called the heavens and the earth into existence, and not the possible ideal God of the sceptical school in the present day. Far more philosophic and scientific was the reflection of La Bruyere on this subject: "*L' impossibilité ou je suis de prouver que Dieu n' est pas me decouvre son existence.*

[r] There is no doubt that Mr. Darwin is a great plagiarist, and Tyndall almost seems to admit as much by the way in which he speaks of Mr. Wallace's

Digitized by Google

Benoit de Maillet, Consul-General of France in Egypt (where he probably heard the ancient fable of all things having sprung from the Nile mud) during the reign of Louis XIV., in his work "Telliamed," propounded the doctrine of Evolution in the following way. He taught that the whole tribe of birds had once existed as *marine animals*, which on being thrown ashore by the waves had got feathers by accident; and that mankind were the descendants of a tribe of sea monsters, who getting tired of their proper element crawled up the beach, and taking a fancy to the land, either forgot or felt a disinclination to return. From these terrestrio-aquatic animals the learned Consul considered the human race to have sprung.

This theory received a fresh impetus a century later from the philosophic Lamarck, who expresses himself respecting it in the following terms:—

"You see in nature a gradation of organized beings, we must therefore admit a series of successive changes by which animals of one class can raise themselves to another. For example, a bird compelled by necessity to seek for water either swims or passes through places of little depth, and its descendants do the same. During the course of many generations the efforts which it made to extend its claws would cause the formation of a membrane, and it would thus become to all intents *a water bird;* or it might extend its feet still more by passing through still deeper waters, and gradually its legs would become as long as those of a crane or flamingo. *These two actions combined, fresh desires and a natural tendency to satisfy them, have united to form man from a monkey.* A species of these animals, probably that of the *orang-outang* of Angola, though of this all remembrance has been lost, began to climb trees, and to seize them with its *hinder* hands as well as those *before.* After having thus walked on the ground for many generations the hinder limbs became formed in a manner suitable to their habits, and feet appeared, by which means these animals were enabled to walk upright. They had no need of their jaws for the purpose of gathering fruit or fighting; they were enabled to employ their fore feet, which were turned into hands, and hence by degrees the snout became shortened and the face more vertical." [a]

Although Lamarck's theory did not obtain any acceptance with the learned world until, as Tyndall shows, it found a vigorous

---

"dignified behaviour" in this matter; but we think he must feel some remorse if he ever meets with a passage such as the following from Charles Bray's "Manual of Anthropology," who says, "The views contained in this chapter were published by me *some thirty years ago*" (A.D. 1841). Since then the works given to the world by Mr. C. Darwin and Mr. A. R. Wallace on "Natural Selection, or Survival of the Fittest," have illustrated them in practice, and in this form they have obtained a wide acceptance." (p. 129.)

[a] Lamarck, "Phil. Zoolog.," vol. ii. p. 443.

Digitized by Google

expounder in the author of the "Vestiges of Creation," who boldly hatched a scheme by which the immediate ancestor of Adam was shown to be a Chimpanzee and his remote ancestor a maggot! Yet it afforded a sufficient clue to Darwin, who has managed to combine all the wisdom of the author of the "Vestiges," the philosophic Lamarck, the ingenious De Maillet, and the celebrated Lord Monboddo as well,—who by the way is too much overlooked in this illustrious catena of Evolution theorists,—since he declares, with as much pride as if he had been first in the field of discoverers to make known the important secret to the scientific world, that

"Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears; that the early progenitors of man were no doubt covered with hair, both sexes having beards, and that men became divested of hair from having originally inhabited some tropical land. . . . In the dim obscurity of the past we can see that the early progenitor of all the vertebrata must have been an aquatic animal, provided with brachiæ, with the two sexes united in the same individual, and with the most important organs of the body (such as the brain and the heart) imperfectly developed. This animal seems to have been more like the larva of our *existing ascidians* than any other known form."

Mr. Darwin admits that though he has found for mankind "a pedigree of prodigious length," it certainly is "not of very noble quality," though he consistently declares, in the teeth of all Scriptural teaching, that "any longer to believe that man is the work of a separate creation" is to adopt the ignorant hypothesis of a "savage!" However he leads his disciples onwards, while carrying out his genealogical researches to their legitimate conclusion, in the following way:—These ascidians, he says, were the parents of a group of fishes as lowly organized as the *lancelet*, and from such fish a very small advance carries you on to the *amphibious*, which gradually developed themselves into *reptiles*, *birds*, and *mammals*; though he cautiously adds that no one can at present say by what line of descent these three higher and related classes sprang from the amphibious; and then he proceeds swimmingly to his conclusion:

"In the class of *mammals* the steps are not difficult to conceive which led from the ancient *monotremata* to the ancient marsupials, and from these to the early progenitors of the placental mammals. We may thus ascend to the *lemuriadæ*, and the interval is not wide from them to the *simiadæ*. The simiadæ then branched off into two great stems,—the New World and *the Old World monkey*; and from the latter at a remote period, MAN, *the wonder and glory of the universe, proceeded!*"[t]

[t] Darwin's "Descent of Man," vol. i. pp. 149, 206, 212; vol. ii. p. 389.

Digitized by Google

Although Mr. Darwin admits that he cannot at present see by what line of descent mammals can be traced back to the amphibious, he is not so reticent respecting the transmutation of species more nearly allied to each other. In his work on "The Origin of Species," he accounts for various changes of one species of quadrupeds, and especially for the enormous head of the cetacea, in the following way:—

"I will give," he says, "two or three instances of diversified and changed habits in the individuals of the same species. When either case occurs it would be easy for *natural selection* to fit the animal by some modification of its structure for its changed habits. Let the organization of a dog be slightly plastic; let the number of rabbits decrease and the number of hares increase, the dog would be driven to catch more hares,—the less fleetness would be rigidly destroyed. *I see no reason to doubt* that these causes in thousands of generations would produce a marked effect. In North America the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with a widely open mouth, thus catching, *almost like a whale*, insects in the water. [*I see no difficulty* in a race of bears being rendered by *natural selection* more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, *till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale!*"][u]

Although Tyndall declares that Mr. Darwin, as the great oracle of the Evolution theory, "shirks no difficulty," and must know its weakness as well as its strength far better than any of his ignorant critics, and his colleague, Professor Huxley,[v] carries his adulation to the zenith of absurdity by comparing his idol's "Origin of Species" to Sir Isaac Newton's "Principia"!!!—we may safely assert that no man whose imagination is controlled by reason can receive so monstrous and ludicrous a hypothesis, that whales can be evolved from bears, or tadpoles transmuted into men! It is scarcely necessary to observe that Mr. Darwin never has found, and we may safely predict never will succeed in finding, a single instance where different species under *natural selection* have produced a new kind which will continue permanently to breed together; for there are two unalterable laws in nature which forbid the possibility of the Darwinian theory being true,—First, the law of *avitism*, which limits variation by parental

[u] Darwin's "Origin of Species," p. 183, first edition. Possibly Mr. Darwin felt some difficulty about the mode by which a whale was evolved from a bear, as the passage in the text between brackets was quietly withdrawn from its place in the first edition, without explanation. It seems, however, to confirm the truth of a remark once made by the late Hugh Miller, that "Never yet was there a fancy so wild and extravagant but that there have been men bold enough to dignify it with the name of philosophy, and ingenious enough to find reasons for the propriety of the name." ("The Old Red Sandstone," ch. iii.)

[v] Huxley in *Contemporary Review*, November, 1871, p. 443.

Digitized by Google

peculiarity; secondly, the law of *hybridism*, which being in itself a limited confusion of nature, bears in itself a barrier to the extension of that confusion in the well-known fact that hybrids cease to breed their like. If, therefore, a law could be found whereby transmutation of species, either by *natural selection* or by any other means, could be promoted, there is a law to prevent change of kind, and the one is totally incompatable with the other. Hence the celebrated naturalist Agassiz points out that however "the processes of development may approach each other, *they never end in making any living being different from the one which gave it birth*, though in reaching that point it may pass through phases resembling other animals. So called varieties or breeds, far from indicating the beginning of new types, or the initiating of new species, only point out the range of flexibility in types which in their essence are invariable."[w] Elsewhere the same acknowledged authority says:—

"It is evident that there is a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the surface of the earth. This progress consist in an increasing similarity to the living fauna, and among the vertebrata especially, in their increasing resemblance to man. But this connection is not the consequence of a direct lineage between the fauna of different ages. There is nothing like parental descent connecting them. The fishes of the Palæozoic age are in no respect the ancestors of the reptiles of the secondary age, nor does man descend from the mammals which preceded him in the Tertiary age. *The link by which they are connected is of a higher and immaterial nature*, and their connection is to be sought in the view of the Creator Himself, whose aim in forming the earth, in allowing it to undergo the successive changes which geology has pointed out, and in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away, was to introduce man upon its surface. Man is the end towards which all the animal creation has tended, from the first appearance of the first Palæozoic fishes."[x]

Far better would it have been for Professor Tyndall's fame, we do not say as a believer in the existence of Deity, but as a man of science, if, instead of referring to Agassiz's surprise at the Darwinian "theory having been received by the best intellects of our time" (p. 45), he had attempted to answer some of the arguments which an innumerable host of really great ones (whom every Christian ranks superior to his "best intellects") have brought against what we must still term the wildest, most illogical, and most unscientific hypothesis that has ever entered the brain of man. The crucial question, concerning the rearing

[w] Agassiz, "Travels in Brazil," pp. 41, 42.

[x] Agassiz, "Comparative Anatomy," § 690.

Digitized by Google

of all mammiferous animals, the newly-born of which can exist only by means of the mammal, how the first baby was suckled if its immediate progenitor was a non mammal, has never been answered yet.[y] And it shows a very feeble belief in his own untenable theory after his somewhat proud boast, "By an intellectual necessity I cross the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in that matter which we, in our ignorance of its latent powers, and notwithstanding *our* professed reverence for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobium, *the promise and potency of all terrestrial life*" (p. 55) for Professor Tyndall to own that when asked to produce the least tittle of evidence to prove that any form of life can be developed out of matter, *he has none to give.*

One of the strongest proofs of the hollowness of a theory is the circumstance that its strongest advocates shrink from applying it in practice; for not long after Tyndall had stated that he recognized in an atom of matter "the promise and potency of all terrestrial life," a discussion arose in *The Times*[z] respecting the origin of *typhoid fever*, he declined to admit the possibility of any such origin for the disease, but ascribed it in all cases to germs derived from some person already infected, thus virtually returning to the old maxim, *Omne vivum ab ovo.* Henceforth therefore we need not be disquieted by any of these pseudo-scientific theories of a self-originated universe from a fortuitous concourse of atoms, or of the potentiality of matter capable of evolving from an Ascidian tadpole a full-grown man. We have only to appeal from Tyndall in his dreaming-cap to the better taught Professor in his laboratory, and all his reveries collapse when imagination is confined within the bounds of reason. As the poet sings:—

> "Lighter than air hope's summer visions fly
> If but a summer cloud obscure the sky,—
> If but a beam of sober reason play,
> So fancy's fairy frost work melts away."

Let it be clearly understood that we have no thought of charging Professor Tyndall with being a "Material Atheist;" for

---

[y] The writer of the above once met with a confirmation of this in his intercourse with Professor Tyndall himself. Having occasionally had the pleasure of exchanging works with that eminent scientist, from whom he has always received the utmost kindness and courtesy, he once took the opportunity of asking the question mentioned in the text; but though twice repeated and accompanied by an assurance that it was not asked in a spirit of idle curiosity or captious criticism he could obtain no reply. The oracle was dumb.

[z] *The Times* published on the occasion a very telling jeu d'esprit in the shape of a letter from "A Promising and Potential Molecule," complaining of the very unfair and unhandsome treatment he had received from the inconsistent Professor Tyndall.

Digitized by Google

we gladly recognize his declaration that "those who hold the doctrine of Evolution have as little fellowship with the Atheist who says, There is no God, as with the Theist who professes to know the mind of God,"[a] but then we fear it is an ideal Deity of his own composing, and not the God of revelation as He is made known to us in His own infallible Word. If Tyndall is at issue with a well-known German Materialist, whom he ranks "among the weaker brethren" because he declares, with more consistency than Darwin or many of His disciples, that "the law of analogies, the formation of prototypes all of which rest upon incontrovertible facts, are *perfectly irreconcilable with the idea of a personal almighty creative power*;[b] he is equally at issue with famous Theists like Newton and Herschell, Brewster and Chalmers, Farraday and Sedgwick, who have shed the lustre of their genius upon the walks of science, combined with the most unswerving faith in the God of the Bible. It would be well for Tyndall if he would lay to heart the noble words of the last of the above named band of worthies:—

"I never could be content," said the late Professor Sedgwick, "while thinking of such things, to feel myself dangling in mid-air without a resting place for the sole of my foot. The true resting point is a reception, both in head and heart of a grand First Cause, the Creator of all the worlds and of all things possessing life. What does the Pantheist give us? A day of uncertain light, of uncertain joy, and a night of eternal darkness. But the better teaching tells us there is a God who is the Father of the universe and careth for all His creatures."

Or the still better testimony of Dr. M'Cosh, who well observes in his "Method of Divine Government,"

"Science has a foundation, and so has religion: let them unite their foundations, and the basis will be broader, and they will be two compartments of one great fabric reared to the glory of God. Let the one be the outer and the other the inner court. In the one let all look, and admire, and adore; and in the other let those who have faith kneel and pray and praise. Let the one be the sanctuary where human learning may present its richest incense as an offering to God, and the other, the holiest of all, separated from it by a vail now rent in twain, and in which, on a blood-sprinkled mercy-seat, we pour out the love of a reconciled heart, and hear the oracles of the living God."

B. W. SAVILE.

---

[a] Essays on the "Use and Limit of the Imagination in Science," by John Tyndall, LL.D., p. 50.

[b] "Force and Matter," by Dr. Louis Büchner, p. 85.

Digitized by Google

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE COLOSSIANS AND PHILEMON.

St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D. Macmillan and Co.

ANOTHER volume of commentary from the hands of Professor Lightfoot is most welcome. By his previous commentaries on the Epistles to the Galatians and Philippians, he had made for himself a high reputation as a Biblical critic and expositor; and the present volume will not detract from his fame, but rather greatly enhance it. Excellent as were the two commentaries before published, specially that on Philippians, we have no hesitation in saying that the one on Colossians and Philemon not only equals, but even surpasses them. It seems to us to supply all that is needed in the way of human help for a thorough understanding of those Epistles. Among English annotators on the Greek Testament, Professor Lightfoot is, in our judgment, *facile princeps;* no other seems to us to combine in such practical completeness so many of the qualities that distinguish an eminent commentator,—acute and sound judgment in the criticism of the text, profound and extensive learning, accurate scholarship, spiritual insight, lucidity and vigour of style.

The volume opens with a very interesting and complete account of the Churches of the Lycus, in which the reader is put in possession of all the circumstances, geographical and historical, a knowledge of which is needed for a realizing and intelligent study of these Epistles, and for a right apprehension of personal and local allusions. In this introduction the question is discussed whether St. Paul ever actually visited Colosse or its adjacent cities of Hierapolis and Laodicea, and in our judgment Professor Lightfoot has given very satisfactory reasons for deciding it in the negative. The narrative of St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles not only affords no ground for the idea, but rather excludes it. St. Paul himself represents his knowledge of the first initiation of the Colossians in the truths of the Gospel, and of their progress in them, as being derived from the report of others. Though opportunities occur again and again where he would naturally have referred to his direct personal relations with them if he had been their evangelist, no such reference is made. If he had actually visited Colosse, it seems strange that he should not once allude to any incident of his sojourn among them, as in letters to other Churches. His own words, however (ii. 1), are conclusive on the point. But though not directly their evangelist, yet to St. Paul were the Colossians evidently indebted for their knowledge of the truth, through Epaphras his

Digitized by Google

delegate and representative. Residing as the Apostle did for three years at Ephesus, it is easy to understand how the influence of his teaching should radiate far beyond the sphere of his own personal visitations. To Ephesus, as the metropolis of Western Asia, would flock crowds from all the towns and villages far and near; whence they would carry away, each to his own neighbourhood, the spiritual treasure which they had so unexpectedly found. Indeed, it is worthy of remark, that St. Luke (Acts xix. 10) distinctly ascribes the wide dissemination of the Gospel in Asia not to journeys undertaken by St. Paul, but to his preaching at Ephesus. Between the cities of the Lycus and Ephesus there seems to have been a very close alliance; and thus, in the natural course of things, may Epaphras, and Philemon of Colosse, and Nymphas of Laodicæa, have fallen in with the Apostle of the Gentiles, and heard from his lips the glad tidings of a heavenly life.

Though Colosse was not an important place, and had no direct personal claims on St. Paul, yet two circumstances combined to attract towards it his special attention, even at a time when (towards the close of his first captivity in Rome) severe personal trials were superadded to the care of all the Churches. The first was the visit of Epaphras, bringing him an alarming account of the heresy which had broken out in the Churches of the Lycus, and was spreading rapidly; secondly, the conversion of Onesimus, the fugitive slave of Philemon of Colosse, whom the Apostle desired to restore to his master, and to commend to his good will. Moved by these circumstances, St. Paul writes the letters to Colosse and to Philemon, dispatching at the same time a circular letter, of which a copy is sent to Laodicea, and which is now familiar to us under the title of the Epistle to the Ephesians.

After the death of St. Paul, the direction of the Asiatic Churches passed into the hands of St. John; and Dr. Lightfoot points out some interesting correspondence between the Epistles of the one to the Churches of the Lycus, and the message of the other to one of those Churches, Laodicea,—showing how the same temper prevailed and the same errors were rife, calling for similar correction from the two Apostles. A very interesting and instructive sketch of the history of these Churches subsequent to Apostolic times is next given, in connection with which our author accounts for their prominence in the ecclesiastical history of the second century, a prominence such as could scarcely have been anticipated from their antecedents, and for the conspicuous part they played in the struggles and development of Christianity. The hypothesis also of the Tübingen School is discussed and satisfactorily refuted, that in the history of Christianity, in Asia Minor, there occurred an entire dislocation and

Digitized by Google

discontinuity; that St. Paul was ignored, and his teaching repudiated, if not anathematized; that upon its ruins was erected the standard of Judaism; that around this, with a marvellous unanimity, deserters from the Pauline Gospel rallied; and that of this retrograde faith St. John was the great champion, and Papias a typical and important representative!

The second portion of this introduction is occupied with a discussion of the Colossian heresy, the nature of which is laid open in a very clear and masterly manner. The Epistle itself indicates two main disturbing elements in the Church at Colosse, endangering the purity of its faith,—one Judaic in its character, the other Gnostic. These however do not represent two distinct heresies, taught by two separate parties; but one heresy, in which these two elements were fused. Prior to and independently of Christianity, Judaism had allied itself with Gnostic modes of thought, by the incorporation on the part of the Essenes (more or less) of the intellectual exclusiveness, the speculative tenets, and the practical errors of Gnosticism, with their own system. As this Judæo-Gnosticism came in contact with Christianity, it began to import into itself some of its ideas,—vaguely indeed at first, but eventually taking a distinct and definite shape in the form of that system called Cerinthianism, against which, at a later period, St. John warned the Churches. From the language of St. Paul, it is evident that in the Colossian heresy there was an approach towards Cerinthian Christology, though speculations on the point were still vague and fluctuating; but in the interval between the Epistle to the Colossians and the writing of St. John's Gospel (nearly a quarter of a century), the elements of Gnosticism, which were before held in solution, had crystallized around the facts of the Gospel.

To the discussion of the Colossian heresy Dr. Lightfoot has added a valuable supplemental dissertation on the name Essene, on the origin and affinities of the Essenes, and on Essenism and Christianity, with special reference to the theory that our Lord Himself was an Essene, or that at all events Christianity was largely indebted to Essenism for its doctrinal and ethical teaching.

In the third part of the Introduction, the character and contents of the Epistle are laid out in its relation to, and refutation of, the heresy which had invaded the Colossian Church. Two leading errors were inculcated by the teachers of this heresy; one theological, the other practical; but both alike springing from the same source,—the conception of matter as the origin and abode of evil. Thus regarding God and matter as directly antagonistic, and therefore apart from, and having no communication with, each other, they sought to explain the creation and government of the world by interposing a series of intermediate beings,

Digitized by Google

emanations or angels, to whom accordingly they offered worship. At the same time, since they held that evil resided, not in the rebellious spirit of man, but in the innate properties of matter, they sought to overcome it by a rigid ascetic discipline, which failed after all to touch the springs of action. As both errors flowed from the same source, they must be corrected by the application of the same remedy,—the Christ of the Gospel. In the Person of Christ, the one Mediator between heaven and earth, is the true solution of the theological difficulty. Through the life in Christ, the purification of the heart through faith and love is the effectual triumph over moral evil. St. Paul therefore prescribes to the Colossians the true teaching of the Gospel as the best antidote to the two-fold danger, which threatens at once their theological creed and their moral principles. Moreover, in the course of his refutation of these errors, the Apostle insists upon the universality of the Gospel as against the intellectual exclusiveness of Gnosticism,—contrasting the true wisdom with the false, and the veritable mystery with the Gnostic rites of initiation.

A very admirable analysis of the whole Epistle closes the Introduction.

Of the annotations critical and exegetical we cannot speak too highly. They are just such as are needed for an intelligent study of the Epistle. Abundant learning pervades them; yet not so as to overload or encumber the notes, but only so as to contribute to the real elucidation of words and phrases. Then another excellent feature in this Commentary, greatly facilitating a right understanding of the Epistle, is that to each group of verses is prefixed a paraphrase, in which the sense and strain of the argument is laid out with admirable clearness and precision. We give as one instance, by way of example, the paraphrase of ii. 16—19:

"Seeing then that the bond is cancelled, that the Law of Ordinances is repealed, beware of subjecting yourselves to its tyranny again. Suffer no man to call you to account in the matter of eating or drinking; or, again, of the observance of a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath. These are only shadows thrown in advance,—only types of things to come: the substance, the reality, in every case, belongs to the Gospel of Christ. The prize is now fairly within your reach: do not suffer yourselves to be robbed of it by any stratagem of the false teachers. Their religion is an officious humility, which displays itself in the worship of angels. They make a parade of their visions; but they are following an empty phantom: they profess humility; but they are puffed up with their vaunted wisdom, which is after all only the mind of the flesh. Meanwhile they have substituted inferior spiritual agencies for the One true Mediator, the Eternal Word. Clinging to these lower intelligences, they have lost their hold of the Head; they have

Digitized by Google

severed their connection with Him, on whom the whole body depends; from whom it derives its vitality, and to whom it owes its unity, being supplied with nourishment and knit together in one by means of the several joints and attachments, so that it grows with a growth which comes from God Himself."

Again: no difficulty is evaded, and the explanation of difficult passages is to our own mind eminently satisfactory. Take for instance the expression, *οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός*, which (as translated in our version, "not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh") is so obscure in meaning when taken in relation to the context. Dr. Lightfoot translates it, "not of any value to remedy or check indulgence of the flesh;" and his vindication of the use of the preposition *πρὸς* after words denoting utility, value, sufficiency, to introduce the object, to check or prevent or cure which the thing is to be employed, is we think complete. It is so used by various Greek writers; and especially, and very frequently so, in the medical treatises of Galen. This rendering of *πρὸς* being established, the translation of the passage by Dr. Lightfoot exactly fits in with the context. The Apostle denies the claims of the system, which the heretical leaders had commended to the Colossians, to the title of *σοφία*; he disputes the value of its *δόγματα*; and while allowing that this *πλησμονή* is the great evil to be checked, the fatal disease to be cured, he will not admit that the remedies prescribed have any substantial and lasting efficacy. In further proof of the ability of our author in dealing with difficult passages, we would refer to the annotations on i. 15—20, ii. 8—15 and 16—19, and to the exhaustive and scholarly detached notes on the meaning of *πλήρωμα*, and on the "Epistle from Laodicea," referred to in iv. 16.

The foregoing remarks bear upon that portion of the volume which deals with the Epistle to the Colossians. We are unable to do more than say, with reference to the Commentary on the Epistle to Philemon, that it is most interesting and excellent. In conclusion, we tender to Dr. Lightfoot our hearty thanks for this Commentary; and we trust that health and strength may be vouchsafed to him to continue labours so valuable and important to the Church. To our readers we commend this volume for their earnest and diligent perusal. For ourselves we are not ashamed to say that we have risen from the study of this Commentary with the feeling that from it we have obtained an insight into the Epistle to the Colossians, and a mastery of its argument and meaning, such as we are conscious we had not before.

Digitized by Google

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. VIII.

Its Bearing on the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

If there is one subject more than another about which there ought to be no controversy among Christians, it is the Lord's Supper. It was intended to bind us together, not to separate us; to sustain us with heavenly food, not to dry up our spirits with bitter gall. Will it ever be to us again what it was to the original Church? However lax some of the early Christians may have been in their practice, we do not gather from the Apostolical writings that there were those strong differences of opinion as to the nature of the ordinance, or as to the mode of its administration, which now exist. The Roman controversy had not arisen; the Presbytery had not yet set up a claim to be considered a sacred caste, armed with supernatural powers. But among Jewish and Gentile converts there would be a predisposition to receive and welcome the Eucharistic rite; for they were not only accustomed to symbolical actions as a mode of setting forth doctrine, but were also in the habit of partaking of sacred feasts, by means of which they entered into communion with one another, and with the Deity whom they venerated.

There can be little doubt that the nature and use of the Lord's Supper was fully explained to the first converts in every Church founded by the Apostles. The paucity of references to it in the Epistles is no argument to the contrary. If St. Paul delivered to the Corinthians the doctrine concerning the Holy Supper, which had been specially revealed to him by the Lord Jesus, doubtless he did the same to all other Churches which he established; and there can be no reason for imagining that the other Apostles and Evangelists neglected to take the same course. In those days every disciple who had been baptized into Christ's death, would be received as a matter of course, after due instruction, at the Holy Supper. He would thus be initiated into the Christian "mysteries," and would fully realize his incorporation into the Christian community, and his vital union with God through Jesus Christ.

Even now, in spite of the grave differences which have sprung up amongst us, few (if any) are prepared to deny that those who meet together in a right spirit to partake of the Lord's Supper, are indeed strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ. The vast majority of Christians acknowledge that this rite affords a special opportunity for personally appropriating the grace which flows forth from Christ crucified; and those who have made any advance in holiness, know full well that such an appropriation is the secret of a godly life. Probably all would

Digitized by Google

consent to the statement that whosoever fulfils the simple conditions specified in our own formularies (*i.e.*, whosoever has real repentance, living faith, and true charity), becomes a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, whilst partaking of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper; and if this be the case we may breathe freely, being assured that amidst our diversities there are essential points of agreement.

It seems almost an idle platitude to say that every man ought to be fully persuaded in his own mind; that such persuasion can only be healthy and trustworthy if it is based upon the evidence contained in the Scripture; that preconceived opinions ought to be put aside as far as possible; and that we ought to be prepared to renounce any portion of our views and of our teaching which shall appear after full inquiry to be inconsistent with the Word of God. Yet after all, these things require no little effort, and no small degree of moral courage. Many who appear to be conscientiously striving to find the truth, drift into almost opposite opinions. They cannot all be right, though each may have certain elements of truth enshrined in the system accepted by him, which others have in some degree neglected. This depends very much upon the point of view from which the subject is approached,—upon the manuals, commentaries, or living teachers which have hitherto guided us,—upon the Church histories which we have read,—and upon our ecclesiastical sympathies generally. Still those who pray and study, and who are content to hold their ideas in solution for a time, will gradually learn some things and unlearn others. They will draw nearer to the truth revealed in Scripture, in proportion as they enter more and more into the spirit of Him who is the Truth; the central principle involved in the Lord's Supper will be stamped on their minds; metaphysical questions will cease to be confused with practical matters; and controversy will give way to that confidence which is at once humble and charitable.

The reason why the New Testament is especially to be studied, is because it supplies us with the only authentic accounts of the original ordinance, and of the object for which it was instituted. Whilst details of arrangement may be fairly left to the decision of particular Churches in each age and country, yet nothing may be added to the rite *as an essential*, for which we do not find Scriptural authority, and nothing is to be taken from it which appears to be an essential in the original institution.

It will be granted by all Christians, with exceptions which need not here be taken into account, that the Lord's Supper was intended to be a permanent ordinance in the Church until the Lord's second coming. It will follow that the significance and efficacy of the rite will always remain the same. The terms of

Digitized by Google

its institution have not lost their force; the blessings to be obtained from a faithful partaking have not degenerated in their nature and value, either through the lapse of time or through the fact that Christ is not still visibly present to bless and distribute the bread and wine. He who now administers the elements, acts for his Master in this matter as in others, trusting in the promise, "Lo I am with you always." The rite is identically the same now as it was originally. Whatever benefits could be received then can be received now. Whatever the expressions, "My body," "My blood," meant then, they mean now,—neither more nor less.

But to this general statement there is one exception to be made, which will be allowed by all parties,—namely, that when the Lord's Supper was originally instituted, it was *proleptic;* that is to say, it had reference to an event just about to be accomplished, and was brought as near to that event as the circumstances of the case rendered possible. Our Lord on several occasions spoke of His sacrificial death, as if it were practically an accomplished fact; not indeed using the *perfect* tense in speaking of it, but the present or incomplete tense, implying that the work was decided upon, and that the course of events would inevitably lead to it. At the time of the institution the Lord regarded His body as in course of being given, and His blood as in course of being shed. These truths the disciples accepted, without fully comprehending them. It must have been clear to them, however, that their Master wished to bind together two things,—the sacramental feast, and His impending death. The one was to be partaken of in memory of the other. The full force of the rite was only apprehended when the truth with regard to the Lord's atoning death was fully revealed to them by the Holy Spirit.

Nothing is more clearly established than that the Lord's Supper stands in close relationship with the paschal supper held on the fourteenth of Nisan. Our Saviour deliberately timed His decease so that it might fall in with this significant rite. On previous occasions attempts had been made on His life, but they were foiled in various ways, for "His time had not fully come." He must needs perish at Jerusalem, where alone the paschal lamb was slain, and His death must synchronize more or less exactly with that event. "After two days," He said, "is the feast of the Passover, and the Son of Man is betrayed to be crucified." "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I die, for .... I will no more eat of it until it be fulfilled in my Father's kingdom." Whatever difficulties critics may find with regard to the chronology of our Lord's last days, nothing can alter two plain facts,—the first of which is

Digitized by Google

that our Lord's atoning death is the "fulfilment" of that which the paschal supper commemorated; the second is that the sacramental feast which we call the Lord's Supper, was from that time forward to take the prominent place in Christian worship which the paschal supper had done among the Jews. Careful study must therefore be given to the original ordinance of the Passover, and to the mode of its observance in our Lord's time.

This institution consisted of two parts. There was the slaying and eating of the paschal lamb in memory of the deliverance of the first-born of each family, through the sprinkling of the blood; and there was the seven days' feast of unleavened bread, to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from the land of Egypt. Thus it was at once both a family and a national feast. The rules with regard to it were remarkably minute and imperative, and were intended to keep alive in the hearts of the people the double salvation which they had already experienced, and also to prepare their minds for a still greater salvation from a worse bondage, to be effected through the bloodshedding of the true Paschal Lamb.

It has been observed in a previous paper, that when the Levitical system was established, the Passover was ranked with the *sacrifices*, properly so called: that is to say, it was not classed with the *burnt-offerings*, which were wholly burnt on the altar; nor with the *meat-offerings*, of which the "memorial" was burnt, while the rest was eaten by the priest; nor with the *sin-offerings*, which were (in ordinary cases) partly burnt and partly eaten by the priest; but with the various *sacrificial* or *communion feasts*, of which a small portion only was burnt (the blood being also sprinkled on the altar), part of the flesh being eaten by the priest and his family, whilst the remainder (that is, the larger portion) was feasted upon by the offerer, with his household and friends.

Thus, though the paschal sacrifice was instituted before Israel had either the Levitical priesthood or the altar, and when it may have been the case that the head of each household was its priest, and the lintel and side-posts of his door had to serve for an altar, yet in after times these primitive features were abandoned. (See Deut. xvi. 2; 2 Chron. xxx. 16, 17; xxxv. 11, 12.) There can be no doubt that in our Lord's time it was essential that the priest should sprinkle the blood of every paschal lamb on the altar at Jerusalem; consequently, when the Lord partook of His last Passover, this duty must have been performed by one of the family of Aaron.

The remainder of the feast did not involve any special sacerdotal act. It was a family festival; the head of each household presided, and conducted the ceremony in due order, according to

Digitized by Google

certain traditional usages, many of which are still observed amidst the Jews. Among these, the only one which need be specially mentioned is the introduction of cups of wine at various stages of the feast.

The slaying of the paschal lamb took place in the afternoon of the fourteenth of Nisan, and was immediately followed by the feast of unleavened bread. During a week, beginning on the fifteenth (*i.e.*, what *we* should call the evening of the fourteenth), which was specially called "the feast" (Lev. xxiii. 6; Num. xxviii. 17), no leaven was to be seen in the houses of the Israelites. There was nothing definitely *sacrificial* in the partaking of unleavened bread, although it was eaten on the first day of the feast, in company with the lamb which was sacrificed. The Passover bread was not a meat-offering, for if it had been it could not have been eaten by the offerer.

Now the Lord's Supper was grafted on this, the non-sacrificial part of the paschal supper. It might have been anticipated that the Saviour, in ordaining a commemorative rite, would have taken the flesh of the Lamb as the symbol of His body, and would have ordered its blood to be sprinkled in memory of Him. To have done this would have been to authorize the continuance of animal sacrifices as commemorative of His death, and the feeding on them as the means of appropriating His atoning merits. But such a course would perhaps have been inconsistent with the fact that our Lord died for *sin*. So far as our Lord's body was regarded as a sin-offering, it would have been contrary to Old Testament ritual for the disciples to have eaten it. Our Lord therefore took the bread and the wine (not the lamb), and gave it to His disciples, indicating thereby that His death was to be *always nutritive*, as well as *once for all propitiatory*. Some have gone so far as to say that there was no paschal lamb at this particular celebration. It would be hard to prove this, but if it were true this would make the non-sacrificial aspect of the Lord's Supper all the more clear.

The expression, "Do this," is sometimes cited to support the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper; and so it may be, if we take the word "sacrificial" in its widest meaning, as including all sacred festivals in which the eater was brought into contact with God. The word here rendered "Do" is very frequently used of the "keeping" of the paschal feast. Not to mention the numerous instances of this in the Old Testament, it will suffice to refer to Matt. xxvi. 18. Here our Lord uses this very word, where our translation is, "I will *keep* the Passover at thy house with my disciples." Nothing could be more appropriate than that He should adopt the same term when ordaining a rite which was to a certain extent based on the Passover.

Digitized by Google

Let us now be present in imagination at the last supper. "*Whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread,*" or rather the bread (*i.e.*, the Passover cake), probably the middle one of the three which were laid before Him, one over the other. "*He blessed;*" that is to say, gave thanks, for to give thanks to God is the true way to call down a blessing on what we eat. "*He brake;*" just as the head of the household always breaks the middle Passover cake in half, and then divides one of the halves into smaller pieces. "*He gave to His disciples, saying, Take ye (or receive), eat ye;*" using the plural number in each case. Thus far the Lord was acting very much as the head of any Jewish household would act at such a time. He was not offering anything to God, but was presenting the memorial of the deliverance from bondage to those whom He accounted His family. As He distributed the pieces, He added these solemn and mysterious words: "*This is my body, which is given* (or *broken*) *for you. Do this* (*i.e.*, keep this rite, no longer in remembrance of your deliverance out of Egypt, but) *in remembrance of Me.*"

Thus the Passover supper was made the turning-point between the ordinances of the Old Dispensation and those of the New. Great as was the salvation commemorated in the old feast, it was to give way to a still greater: the disciples were henceforward to keep a feast in remembrance of Him who was then just about to become the Bread of life, and who had said, "The Bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John vi. 51.)

The Lord then proceeded to set forth a still further aspect of His redemptive work, so as to confirm and complete the new ordinance. The cups of wine were not specified as part of the original institution of the Passover, but they were added in early times, and the Saviour took the feast as He found it, applying the existing usages to His purpose, just as He had done in the case of the feast of tabernacles, where the drawing and pouring out of water was not part of the prescribed ordinance. Accordingly "*He took the cup* (one of the four cups which were introduced at various stages in the feast), *and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it; for this cup* (which contains the blood of the grape) *is the new covenant* (ratified) *in my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Do this, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance* (not of the Old Covenant, but) *of Me.*" Just as the deliverance from Egypt became the basis of the Mosaic covenant, so the greater salvation was intimately connected with the ratification of the New covenant, according to which God would write His laws in men's hearts, and their sins and iniquities He would remember no more. Now, as an inspired writer has said, "Where remission

Digitized by Google

of these is there is no more sin-offering." Thus at the critical moment of Christ's bloodshedding on the cross, the Old Covenant and all its attendant rites vanished away; the Levitical types received their fulfilment, and having served their purpose, ceased to be efficacious; the priesthood, the altar, the offerings, the incense, the veil, the ark, the mercy-seat, the sprinkling of blood, the rites connected with the day of atonement, in short all the Mosaic ceremonies and symbols were nailed to the cross, taken out of the midst, and done away with. They made way for the great reality which they all foreshadowed in various ways.

As the Old Covenant was not ratified without blood, so neither was the New. In the one case, the Book of the Law, which was the Word of God, and also the people, were sprinkled with the blood of bulls and goats; and not with blood alone, but also with water. (See Heb. ix. 19.) In the other case, He who united in Himself the two covenanting parties, being at once the living Word of God and the divinely-appointed representative of the people, was sprinkled with more precious blood, for out of His pierced side there flowed blood, and not blood alone, but also water.

Here, then, are the great truths presented to us in the Lord's Supper: deliverance from a worse than Egyptian bondage, and the ratification of a new and spiritual covenant, both effected through the death of Christ upon the cross.

It is sometimes asked whether the Christian partakes of Christ's literal body as it then was, or of His risen body, or of His ascended body. Was it some supra-material body, some mystical body, some supra-local presence? The answer is very clear: it was the body which then was, and which the disciples beheld before them. It was the blood then coursing through that sacred body. It was the body just about to be given, and the blood just about to be shed. It was the Lord's human body regarded as an offering for the world's sin, and His life-blood regarded as a ransom for many. These were what the bread and wine represented, and these were to be fed upon in the heart of the believing disciple whilst he ate the sacramental bread, and drank of the covenant cup. And as it was then, so it is now: the *body which is given*, and the *blood which is shed*, these, and not some mystical body and blood, are represented by the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper.

Again, it may be asked, in what sense can Christians eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord? Certainly not in the gross material sense in which we eat the flesh of animals, and in which barbarians have drunk the blood of their enemies. Such an idea is abhorrent to every mind, and need not be combated, because no one, unless hard pressed in controversy, has

Digitized by Google

ever put it forth. It is evident that the disciples made no mistake on this point. In fact the terms of the ordinance precluded it, for the only things which the disciples were told to eat and drink were the bread and wine; but they were to do this in remembrance of certain truths about their Lord, which truths were symbolized or represented in the broken bread and poured forth wine. The feeding upon Christ in our hearts by faith is *real*, but it is totally different from the carnal acts of eating and drinking, and the strengthening and refreshing effects of it are felt not in the body, but in the soul.

We must be especially careful at this stage, lest we add to or take from the Lord's ordinance. He was instituting a rite, not announcing a miracle. He did not say, "This bread has become my body," or "This bread is turned into my body," but "This (which you are now about to eat) is my body," by which words He could only mean, "This bread thus broken *represents* my body;" just as in Gen. xl. 12, the words, "The three branches *are* three days," signify that the three branches *represent* three days; and just as in Ezek. xxxvi. 11, where we read, "These bones *are* the house of Israel," we understand that the bones *represented* the house of Israel. So no doubt the disciples would understand the words in question, for this is not only a legitimate interpretation, but also the natural one to occur to any one trained as the Jew was in the use of representative rites.

But are we to suppose that the Lord communicated to the bread and wine (by the act of blessing or otherwise) some special virtue? Was the efficacy of His slain body incorporated in the bread? Was the blood of the covenant infused into the wine, in such a sense as that the virtue implanted in them entered the mouth in and with the elements, and acted in the spirit through the body? Or shall we rather suppose that the Lord appointed that the benefits of His offering and bloodshedding should be specially vouchsafed to those who partook of the elements worthily (*i.e.*, in a right spirit), so that while the natural man received the bread and wine, the spiritual man should be strengthened and refreshed by feeding on Christ crucified?

Turning once more to the Jewish rite on which the Lord's Supper was grafted, we see strong ground for taking the latter rather than the former view. The paschal supper *was*, and *still is* always accompanied with the reading of the law. A little child still asks the meaning of the various ceremonies observed on the occasion, and the answer is given from the Scriptures. Thus, whilst there was a bodily feeding on the lamb, the bread, and the wine, there was a spiritual repast going on as well: the partaker was drinking in the old, old story about the deliverance

Digitized by Google

of Israel from Egypt. The two kinds of feeding were going on together, but were totally distinct in their nature.[a]

The question, however, which has just been raised, must not be lightly dismissed, for it is here that Christians part company with one another. All agree that the disciple feeds upon Christ by faith in the Holy Supper; but some teach that the elements themselves are invested, after consecration, with all that is essential to the very nature of the body and blood of our Lord, whilst others teach that the benefits of the Lord's passion are conferred on the faithful recipient in (*i.e.*, during and by means of) the rite,—not *in* the elements, but concurrently with the right reception of them. According to this last view, the benefits of Christ's passion act on the spirit analogously, and also more or less contemporaneously, with the refreshing, strengthening effect of the bread and wine on the body. The bread and wine are not only signs, but also pledges of the nutritive power of the body and blood of Christ, and the believer in receiving them receives food from Christ.

These views cannot both be true, and the difference between them is not so slight as some might think. If the elements are either changed into or impregnated with the material body and blood of Christ, then we have not a miracle, indeed, which is an appeal to the senses, but a stupendous mystery,—an appeal to faith, which nothing would justify us in accepting but the most plain warrant of Scripture. Something more than the original words of the institution must be brought forward before men can be asked to receive such a doctrine. It is true that the theories of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, as held by the Roman and Lutheran Churches respectively, together with the theory sometimes called transaccidentation, which has been put forth by some members of our own Church, claim to be analogous with and a continuation of the doctrine of the incarnation. But "impanation" (*i.e.*, the infusion of Christ's body into the consecrated bread) is a very different thing from "incarnation;" for if it was infinite condescension in the Son of God to be made in the likeness of man, what words can we find to describe the spirit and motive which could prompt Him to enter thousands and tens of thousands of pieces of bread and wafer which had been moulded and manipulated by human hands?

This theory, however, must not be discarded merely because it seems strange or incredible, for with God nothing is impossible; but no one can be called to receive it unless it can be

[a] It will be found, in studying the Old Testament, that all thanksgiving sacrifices were connected with certain historical facts,—certain *deliverances*, whether individual, family, or national,—and these facts were fed upon by the inner man, whilst the sacrificial feast was partaken of by the outer.

Digitized by Google

proved from Scripture. If it is to be believed, we may be sure that it has been fully and clearly announced; that it is in accordance with the general analogy of Scripture; and that it does not depend on a hazardous and uncritical interpretation of one or two texts.

Again, if this theory be true, and if it is the special function of the presbyter to introduce the atoning efficacy of Christ's sinbearing and bloodshedding into the bread and wine by the act of consecration, then a position is given to him in comparison with which that of the Old Testament priesthood is as nothing. But where in the New Testament do we find provision made for the communication of such a power unto men? Once more: the devout Roman Catholic, who believes that all which is essential to our Lord's human nature is in the consecrated wafer, is consistent in bowing down to it. But such adoration of the unseen Saviour enshrined within a material object is so perilously near a breach of the second Commandment, that nothing but the most plain directions in the New Testament could justify it. If it be said that though the doctrine is not in the Scripture, yet the Church has gradually developed it, then we fall back on the old question on which Protestants and Roman Catholics must always differ, namely, What is your authority for propounding a doctrine and theory which is not only not contained in Scripture, but which in many of its aspects runs counter to the plain teaching of the Word of God, and to the general analogy of revealed truth?

Scripture everywhere teaches us that the inner man needs to be strengthened and refreshed by food and drink, and the terms which we use primarily of material sustenance for the physical frame, are applied to the food needed for the spiritual nature. Thus the Prophet Isaiah invites him that hath no money to buy *wine* and *milk* without money and without price; to spend money no longer on that which satisfieth not, but to *eat* that which is good. The context shows that he is referring to the nutritive effect of God's Word on men's souls. (Is. lv. 1, 2.) Similarly the Prophet Jeremiah says, "Thy words were found, and I did *eat* them." (Jer. xv. 16.) And again, "He shall *feed* you with knowledge and understanding." (Jer. iii. 15.) Turning to the New Testament, we find St. Paul saying to the Corinthians, "I have *fed* you with *milk*, and not with *meat* (1 Cor. iii. 2); and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (v. 13) we read, "Ye are become such as have need of *milk*, and not of *strong meat*." Also St. Peter teaches us that it is "the sincere or unadulterated *milk* of the Word, on which the Christian thrives." (1 Peter ii. 2.) None of these passages speak of the change of material food into spiritual, but they imply that there is some analogy between the

Digitized by Google

nature and use of the one and of the other. Now the food of the inner man in the above instances is the WORD, by which is to be understood not the bare text of Scripture, but the truth contained therein and brought home to the heart by the Spirit of God, so that it becomes bread, meat, wine, and milk to the hungry soul. The records of God's dealings with man, His overruling providence,—His longsuffering, tenderness, and power,—His care for those who are in trouble,—the exhibitions of His holiness and purity,—these were the things that sustained and strengthened the Old Testament saints. When the Son of God came into the world, He embodied and gathered into Himself all the phases of Divine grace and holiness which had been exhibited in the older dispensation. He fulfilled history, type, and prophecy, and thus became the Truth, as well as the Way and the Life. His oral teaching was an exposition of the truth; His character and works were witnesses to it. His atoning work on the cross broke down the last barrier which existed between God and man, and became a life-giving and a life-sustaining revelation of the Father to the soul of man.

Accordingly when our Lord instituted the holy feast, He did not simply say, "This is my body," "This is my blood," but "This is my body which is given for you," and "This cup is the New Testament (ratified) in my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." Thus *the truth about His body, viz.*, that it was given as an offering; and *the truth about His blood, viz.*, that it was shed to secure the blessings of the New Covenant; these are presented to our minds in the Lord's Supper; and as we faithfully feed upon them, the Saviour by His Spirit causes them to become bread and wine to our souls.

It is in proportion as the quickened soul feeds on Christ crucified, that the work of spiritual assimilation proceeds. The self-sacrificing Spirit of the Head flows into the members. Moral force is developed, selfishness is conquered, impurity and deceit are banished, the conscience is rendered sensitive, peace is confirmed, good works are wrought, worldliness and formalism are expelled.

The conclusion which we are led to is this: that the benefits of Christ's death are infused not into the elements of bread and wine, but into those who partake of them in a faithful spirit. The food which strengthens the body symbolizes the life-giving truth about Christ crucified which sustains the spirit. The acts of eating and drinking in the one case are analogous and concurrent with the reception or appropriation of the Gospel into the inner man; the feeding in the latter case is as real as the former, but is of a different kind. It is not that

Digitized by Google

which goeth into the mouth, but that which goeth into the heart which sustains the inner man. It is with the heart that man believeth unto salvation. As one of the old Fathers said, "Believe, and thou hast eaten." Accordingly our Prayer-book teaches the Christian to feed on Christ crucified in his heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

It may be asked, What is it which we are to believe, as we approach the Lord's Table? What is the thought which should occupy our minds at that solemn moment? Is it that the bread is turned into Christ's flesh, and that the wine is turned into His blood? No: rather we are to bear in mind that the bread represents His flesh broken for us, and that the wine represents His blood shed for us; and just as we take the significant elements with the mouth, so are we to receive in our hearts by faith the glorious truths which they represent. As we do so, Christ's flesh becomes to us food indeed, and His blood drink indeed.

A few points rising out of the past discussion will be considered next month, in the concluding paper of this series.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Story of the Irish Church Missions. (Continued to the year 1869.*) London: Nisbet.* 1875.—It was a bold adventure of *faith* which this story records. The reward of faith in the marvellous success of the enterprise, with the graphic details of the work as it rapidly spreads, surmounting every difficulty, renders this collected account a book of more than ordinary interest in the annals of Missionary effort; indeed there is a charm and fascination about it which carries the mind on, from point to point, eager to learn what is next to follow. It is a record of the possibilities of faith in a very practical aspect. A country clergyman, in a quiet English parish, yearns over the sad condition of the misguided Romanists of Ireland. His masterly mind, fertile in resource, disciplined by a service in the Duke of Wellington's army in the Peninsula, plans schemes for their emancipation and enlightenment. But he had neither money nor other means for putting his plans into execution, and a great mountain of *impossibility* stands before him. He is not however to be daunted. "All things are possible to him that believeth." Before prayer and believing effort the mountain removes, and this volume recounts the wonderful way in which God puts honour upon simple trust.

The providential leadings by which the Rev. Alexander Dallas,

Digitized by Google

the founder of the Missions, was brought into happy contact with a large number of the Irish clergy,—the coincident prayer, for the same object, which was being put up, by parties unknown to one another, at Wonston this side, and Clifden on the other side of the Irish Channel,—the advantage, adroitly taken, of the recently established "penny postage" to convey simultaneously to about 20,000 Roman Catholic households a letter, "A Voice from Heaven to Ireland," before the obstructive priests could get even an inkling of the design; the amazement produced by this mysterious shower of letters, and the wonderful movement which followed, are matters with which many of the readers of missionary history are familiar. They will nevertheless welcome this volume as bringing before them, in one view, scenes which they have heretofore delighted in; and to those to whom the story is new it will open up a history,—no less full of incidents and adventure than it is of blessing conferred upon thousands,—which, for twenty-five years, has been enacting almost within their view.

Voices of Comfort. Edited by Thomas Vincent Fosbery, M.A. Second Edition. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875. —The Editor of this volume was an intimate friend and Honorary Chaplain of Dr. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and Winchester. This fact would not in itself be any great encouragement to Evangelical persons to have recourse to these "Voices" for true consolation, nor would it furnish any guarantee that they might not be more dulcet than reliable. Upon perusal, however, there is much in the book that is profitable as well as beautiful. It consists of extracts chiefly from well-known writers, such as Archbishop Leighton, Archer Butler, St. Augustine, Jeremy Taylor, and even occasionally Owen and Cecil. There are of course large portions from Bishop Wilberforce and from Mr. Fosbery's own writings. Collects and litanies and hymns from various sources are added. The meditations, or "Voices," are arranged for each day of one month. Altogether, although we could not commend it unreservedly, it presents a pleasing specimen of what may be termed High Church devotion; sober, and in the main edifying. It contrasts most favourably with the diluted Romanism now so constantly circulated among unsuspecting readers of the school to which we have referred, which is often as vapid in quality as it is noxious in its tendencies.

Rome, and the Newest Fashions in Religion. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. London: Murray. 1875.—It is no business of ours curiously to inquire what have been the motives which can have impelled Mr. Gladstone, after the best part of a long lifetime spent in dallying with and promoting the objects of Roman Catholics, nay while even now exerting his utmost influence to shield Ritualists in practices which their most advanced leaders are urging for the avowed purpose of Romanizing the Church of England, to make the fierce onslaught upon Rome which he has done in the volume before us. The spectacle is as strange as that was of Saul among the prophets. We can however only welcome the accession of the strange ally, whose participation in the controversy must have been as bewildering

Digitized by Google

to Romanizers as that of the elephants in the army of King Pyrrhus was upon the Romans of old, until they got accustomed to them. Somehow or another it would seem that although, as he admits, Rome is and ever has been "Eadem," yet that what he delights in calling "Vaticanism" is, he thinks, some new thing. If he could free himself from the bondage of this last delusion, his value as a controversialist would be still greater than it is. Any how, all that Protestants have been charging upon Rome for the last century, and for which they have been branded as uncharitable bigots, blind and ignorant, has been reasserted by Mr. Gladstone, with crushing force. The volume may be very serviceable for those who probably would not listen with patience or credence to ordinary Protestant writers. Mr. Gladstone's object has been "to produce, if possible, a temper of greater watchfulness; to promote the early and provident fear which, says Mr. Burke, is the mother of necessity; to disturb that lazy way of thought which acknowledges no danger until it thunders at the door; to warn my countrymen against the velvet paw and soft exterior of a system which is dangerous to the foundation of civil order, and which any of us may at any time encounter in his daily path." Mr. Gladstone quotes Virgil freely. Will he pardon us for saying that as he has had no insignificant share in bringing the fatal engine, "*fœta armis*," into our midst, so we hope that the curse which has befallen Cassandra may not rest upon his utterances; "*Dei jussu non unquam credita Teucris.*"

The Additional Hymn-book. Compiled by the Rev. J. C. Ryle, M.A., etc. London: Hunt. 1875.—Any publication issued by Mr. Ryle is sure to meet with a welcome from all who value evangelical truth. Even then when he adds another to the multitude of our hymn-books his labours will find acceptance with many. There is just now a burst of song in the Churches, which testifies to vigour of religious feeling, for "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Mr. Ryle has therefore, notwithstanding the many recent hymn-books offered to the public, included in this compilation no less than 250 (out of 300, of which it consists) which are not to be found in any popular collection used in our churches: many of them, as he says, very beautiful and deservedly popular. Among them are several of Sankey's sacred songs.

Ought we to Obey the New Court? By Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Pickering. 1875.—This is a reprint from an article in the *Contemporary Review*. Mr. Shipley prefaces it with a quotation from the Eighth Book of Hooker. "If the cause be spiritual, ... boldly and lawfully we may refuse to answer before any civil judge." Without undertaking to argue here the value of what professes to be the Eighth Book of the Ecclesiastical Polity, and how far what we have is genuine, or whether Mr. Shipley can safely shelter his notions under the venerable name of Hooker, we wish he had continued his quotation so far as to have added, "*So that we do not mistake either the nature of the cause or of the Court, as we easily may do both:*" which Hooker, or what passes for Hooker, judiciously but somewhat inconveniently for Mr. Shipley adds. It would be needless to discuss further his plea for lawlessness.

Digitized by Google

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

MORE than common interest has been awakened during the past month by the departure of the Prince of Wales to visit our vast dependency of India. It is not always remembered that our Queen is Empress of Hindostan; it is therefore gracious policy to the feudatories of our great empire that they should have opportunity of personal intercourse with the Heir Apparent to the throne. A journey to India may now be accomplished with less inconvenience than formerly attended an extended tour in Europe, but still there is sufficient risk and anxiety connected with it that it is seemly and right that special intercession should be made on behalf of the Prince; and it is with pleasure we note that it has been already recommended in several quarters with suitable forms of prayer. "*Reddat Deus incolumem.*"

Public attention has been still concentrated upon the proceedings of our Admiralty. The loss of the "Vanguard" has not been so much matter of regret, as of suspicion as to the qualifications of our naval officers. Grave doubts are entertained whether that marvellous seamanship which was formerly the glory and protection of England has not deteriorated since the introduction of steam. The science, though not the courage, of our seamen is called into question. Serious indignation has been, moreover, excited by most injudicious orders issued on the subject of fugitive slaves. It is impossible not to condemn in the severest terms what is neither more nor less than a reversal of the policy which England has so long, and at so much cost, upheld with regard to slavery. Popular feeling has rarely been so unanimous as in reprobation of this untoward mistake. It has hardly been appeased by the suppression of the Instructions. Policy, as well as wisdom, would have dictated an immediate cancelling of regulations which, however well meant, have been not only a blunder but a crime. It is curious to note how naval matters have again imperilled the popularity, if not the existence, of our present Government.

We note, with much satisfaction, the successful effort made by the Dean and Chapter of Worcester at the recent musical festival at that city, to diminish the shameful scandals which have so persistently grieved and scandalized godly persons by the desecration of our Cathedrals on the recurrence of these festivities. The charity for which this profanation was ostensibly undertaken has suffered no loss, and the house of God has not been degraded into a music hall. There has been a Church Congress at Stoke-upon-Trent. It was not so numerously

Digitized by Google

attended as previous gatherings of the same kind have been. We hope that this is an indication that these miscellaneous assemblies are felt to be of little, if any, benefit to the Church; assuredly they are of none to the Evangelical portion of it. Confusion, not edification, is the natural result of compromise and loose declamation.

Spain is still the theatre of prolonged but feeble hostilities. More attention has been excited by the financial embarrassments of Turkey, which have been brought to a climax by the still unsubdued insurrection in Herzegovina. What is almost tantamount to a repudiation of the obligations of foreign creditors has brought Turkey down to the level of Spain. The curse of Mohammedanism, like the curse of Romanism, has reduced both these countries, which contain all the natural elements of prosperity, to the most abject pitch of financial as well as political misery. France is much agitated by the efforts made by the priesthood to regain hold of superior education, which has been so long denied them. Serious political complications are likely to result through the indignation aroused in the minds of the Republicans, intolerant as they are of priestcraft.

There seems to be now assurance that war with China, which has been imminent, may yet be averted, and that concessions have been made by the Chinese which will bring about a pacific solution of our differences with the Celestial Empire. China seems to be once more in a deplorable state of confusion, without any capable Government.

We cannot close this record of the month without paying a passing word of tribute to the memory of one so much beloved and so highly honoured as the Rev. Thomas Vores, of Hastings. His career was an important but apparently an uneventful one; nevertheless it was one marked with incidents of ministerial success which fall to few of even the most eminent of God's servants. "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life, and he that winneth souls is wise." The Dean of Chichester (Dr. Hook) and Sir Charles Wheatstone are dead.

NOTICE.

Communications to the Editor, and Books for Review, should be addressed—
To the Editor of the "Christian Observer and Advocate,"
Care of Messrs. William Hunt and Company,
23, Holles Street, Cavendish Square,
London. W.

[Subscribers to the "Christian Observer" wishing to complete their sets, can, *for a limited period*, obtain copies by application to the Editor as above, at the reduced price of one shilling per number.]

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER

AND ADVOCATE.

NEW SERIES. } No. 12. DECEMBER. [1875.

THE "REST" ON THE SEVENTH DAY.

GENESIS II. 1—3.

IN this passage is contained the record of two distinct facts. The former, which is too commonly overlooked or but slightly noticed, is this: that, having on the sixth day completed the work of "restoration of the earth," and having at the close of this work of restoration created man, God on the seventh day rested.[a] The second fact is the institution in connection with this "rest" of a Sabbath, or day of rest, for man. "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified (or hallowed) it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made," or created *to make or to fashion*. To one or both of these facts there is in the subsequent Scriptures frequent and most important reference. Moses himself, in the fourth commandment, refers to both.[b] The prophet Isaiah refers to both.[c] St. Paul, in his reference to both, teaches also that "the rest" typified by Canaan, is the same as that intended in the former of these facts: viz., "the rest" with which God "rested."[d] And lastly, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, referring both to the latter fact and to the dominion over all other creatures on the earth given to man,[e] says, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath."[f]

The believing student will recognize the truth and importance of facts thus recorded by one inspired writer, and to the record to which other inspired writers refer. He will not omit, as some commentators have omitted, all notice of the former; nor will he content himself with dubious reasons or with bare conjecture as to these words recording the original institution of the Sabbath

[a] See "Scripture interpreted on Scripture Principles," Published by H. Ling, Dorchester.

[b] Exodus xx. 8—11. [c] Isaiah lviii. 13, 14.

[d] Hebrews iv. [e] Genesis i. 26. [f] Mark ii. 27, 28.

Digitized by Google

Day. Since God has seen fit to reveal that on this occasion He "rested," and that in consequence He blessed and sanctified the seventh day as a day of rest for man, it will not be in a spirit of vain curiosity nor of empty speculation, but with a sincere desire to do God's will and to receive His blessing, that a believer will inquire into the nature of the blessing which, in connection with that "rest," belongs to those who "keep holy the Sabbath Day."

As to "the rest" with which "God rested," Moses in another place[g] employs a yet stronger expression: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He *rested* and *was refreshed*." In this expression, however, as in the other, it must be evident that the language of finite beings must fail correctly to set forth ideas respecting the one Infinite Being. The latter expression especially would appear to speak as of one resting and finding refreshment, or *even taking breath* under the sense of weariness after toil and exertion. But Moses could never have intended to express this respecting Him of whom the prophet Isaiah writes: "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary?"[h]

We cast aside, then, such a signification as this; and in the brief narrative itself we observe, that, besides the cessation from the work of the six days, which is certainly included in the word "rest," there is also included that idea of the rest which is experienced in *satisfaction* with the work accomplished. "God saw everything that He had made; and, behold, it was very good." It is to be gathered also from other portions of Scripture, that in these works and their excellence God not only saw the perfection of their form, and structure, and nature, and of their wondrous adaptation to each other; but He looked on them as His own works. They had been wrought according to His eternal purpose and will, and by His wisdom and might: they reflected therefore His glory,—the glory of His infinite wisdom and of His boundless power. Moreover, they were steps towards the exhibition of other of His attributes, and towards the fulfilment of other and infinitely higher purposes than that of the creation of man and of this material world. "According to the eternal purpose, which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," on this earth, so prepared, there was to be "made known by the Church unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God."[i] And in all this there was to be an exhibition of those attributes of God, which in the works of His visible creation are not to be seen: even holiness, and truth, and

[g] Exodus xxxi. 17. [h] Isaiah xl. 28. [i] Eph. iii. 9, 10.

Digitized by Google

mercy, and love. There was to be exhibited, moreover, the perfect harmony of infinite holiness and infinite mercy, and all "the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of that love which passeth knowledge,"—even that love, which in the fulness of time should be seen in the incarnation and in the atoning sacrifice of Him who, while "Son of Man," should yet be "Son of God," the Word, by whom and for whom all things both visible and invisible in heaven and in earth had been made.

Nay, if from other inspired writers is rightly to be gathered the typical teaching of this narrative of creation, and of the work of the six days, then in all the glorious reality of these works there was mirrored the far higher glory of the new creation, of the Redeemer's kingdom, and of all those riches of grace and mercy which would in the fulness of time call forth from that multitude that no man can number the ascription of "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."[j] And if so, there must then be further included, under the idea of this "rest," that joy with which, as the psalmist teaches us, the Lord rejoices in His works;[k] that "rejoicing in the habitable parts of His earth," and those delights with the sons of men of which Wisdom speaks;[l] that pleasure which the Lord takes in His people;[m] that delight with which His soul is said to delight in His elect,[n] with which "He is well pleased in His beloved Son."[o] All this is indeed beyond our comprehension; but simply because it has to do with the infinite God. Yet in these and in similar passages there surely is revealed, and that in traceable connection with these early works of creation and restoration, personal satisfaction, joy, delight, pleasure, and love.

This satisfaction, joy, delight, pleasure, and love in the eternal God must, like Himself, be infinite. Nor can they be limited in duration any more than in degree. It should therefore be noticed,—first, that while the limitation of morning and evening is attached to each of the six days of work, there is no such limitation attached to the seventh day, the day of rest; and in the next place, it should be noticed that the partaking of this rest, or "the entering into it by man,"[p] so evidently intended in and through the institution of the Sabbath, implies of necessity that continuance of God's resting, which in the passages just adduced is so clearly set forth. The following words thus connect this rest with the Divine institution of the Sabbath: "God blessed

---

[j] Rev. v. 13. [k] Psalm civ. 31. [l] Prov. viii. 31.
[m] Psalm cxlix. 4. [n] Isaiah xlii. 1. [o] Matt. iii. 17.
[p] Heb. iv. 1, 3, 9.

Digitized by Google

the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all the work, which God created to make."

When the Lord Jesus, referring to this original institution of the Sabbath, says, "The Sabbath was made for man," He teaches that in the blessing attached to it man was blessed rather than the day; and the words of institution themselves imply that through the sanctification of the day the promised blessing is imparted. For this sanctification there must be cessation from all ordinary worldly labour and employment; and this, accordingly, is in the fourth commandment enjoined by God. Neither, however, in such rest from toil does the sanctification of the day consist; nor, although to multitudes of men and of the brute creation such rest is a great boon, is this in itself the blessing with which God blesses those who keep holy the Sabbath day.

The full idea of both,—of the sanctification of the day, and of the blessing attached to it,—is thus expressed in the prophet Isaiah: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou *delight thyself in the Lord;* and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." [q]

These words surely express not only rest from the toil of ordinary occupation during the six days, but a ceasing, on the part of the individual believer, from self and self indulgence, and such a sanctification of the Sabbath to the Lord as shall make the day to every such individual *a delight.* And the blessing here attached to such a regard for the day can be none other than that "joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ," of which they partake who "by Him receive the atonement;" [r] "that joy unspeakable, and full of glory," experienced by those who believe in Christ and love Him; [s] and that "sitting together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," [t] together with all that "fulness of blessing" included in the reality of having "our life hid with Christ in God," [u] of abiding in Christ and "having Christ abiding in us," [v] of being one with the Father and the Son." [w]

The Sabbath, then, if regarded aright, as "the holy of the Lord and honourable," must be devoted or given up to Him. It is not rightly sanctified to Him by one whose mind is unoccupied with thoughts of Him,—with correct thoughts of Him,—derived

---

[q] Isaiah lviii. 13, 14. [r] Rom. v. 11. [s] 1 Pet. i. 8. [t] Eph. ii. 6.
[u] Col. iii. 3. [v] John xv. 4, [w] John xvii. 21.

Digitized by Google

from the revelation which He has made of Himself in His works and in His inspired word, and especially from the manifestation of Himself through the word in Him who is "the image of the invisible God,"[x] "the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person."[y]

Such thoughts will be more or less exercises of faith; and he who lives and walks by faith will indeed seek at all times to cherish them. In that withdrawal, however, of worldly objects from his attention, and in the cessation from ordinary occupation required in the sanctification of the Sabbath, he perceives an immense opportunity, which is manifestly designed of God for more largely cherishing such thoughts. Of this opportunity he takes advantage. In doing this he fulfils God's purpose: he keeps the commandment to hallow the Sabbath day. Thus the believer becomes even on earth a partaker of the blessing: "He enters into rest,"—into "God's rest."[z] As he contemplates and adores the glory of God, he experiences a satisfaction, a joy, a delight, a pleasure, and a sense of God's love toward himself, which although imperfect and sometimes clouded, as everything on earth must be, yet, partaking of the nature and character of "God's rest," is an earnest and a foretaste of the eternal fruition of the Glorious Godhead in heaven,—of that rest into which our great High Priest passed, when He ceased from the works of the new creation,[a]—even the redemption and salvation of His people,—and into which at the close of his argument on this subject, the Apostle exhorts believers to labour that they may enter.

Now all this which has its source and origin in this brief narrative of the institution of the Sabbath is the general teaching of Scripture; and it speaks of joy unspeakable and full of glory, as the portion of the believer on earth, and it reveals, when rightly understood, unspeakable and endless bliss as his portion for ever.

Before giving instances of such general teaching, we would beg our readers to observe carefully three expressions of very frequent use in Scripture, of which writers on the Sabbath, and commentators generally, take little account. These are: "the name of the Lord" (Jehovah); "the glory of the Lord;" and "the mercy and truth," or "the loving kindness and faithfulness of the Lord." All of these, as we have seen, are either displayed or typified in and through the works of the six days; from which works God is said "to rest," and on which He looked with satisfaction, delight, joy, and pleasure. In the narrative of the revelation which the Lord made of Himself to Moses on

---

[x] Col. i. 15. [y] Heb. i. 3. [z] Heb. iv. 3. [a] Heb. iv. 10, 11.

Digitized by Google

the second occasion of his receiving the law,[b] all these expressions are combined. For, having pleaded with God on behalf of the people, Moses prayed for himself: "I beseech Thee show me Thy glory." And the Lord replied, "I will make all my goodness to pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee." A verse which follows shows also that this goodness and this glory are the same; or that in His goodness was the especial manifestation on this occasion of the glory of the Lord.

When the time of the fulfilment of this promise had arrived there was indeed a visible manifestation of glory: but together with this "the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with Moses there (in the cleft of the rock), and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation."

Let the whole narrative of this wondrous revelation be carefully observed, and let the circumstances be considered under which Moses made his request, and the Lord answered it,—even the grievous sin of the people; and it will be seen that the main features of "the name of the Lord," or the character of the Lord, proclaimed on this occasion, are His mercy and loving-kindness in the pardon of sin, combined with His holiness and justice, and His faithfulness to His covenant engagements. Such a combination of attributes apparently so opposed to each other, or rather their reconciliation and consistency was and is inconceivable by man untaught of God. Subsequently there was a fuller revelation of them made to the Psalmist,[c] who wrote, "Mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." It was not, however, until *He* had come who in His own person and by His atoning sacrifice effected this reconciliation of His attributes, that "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" was fully revealed, even "in the face of Jesus Christ."[d] Such a Saviour was purposed, foretold, and foreshadowed from the beginning; and through faith in Him it was that the elders, such as Abel, Enoch, and Noah, received the testimony that they, though sinners in themselves, were accounted righteous by God, and that they became "heirs of the righteousness which is by faith."[e]

Possessed of such knowledge of God, and of His character or

---

[b] Exodus xxxiii. 18.; xxxiv. 1—8. [c] Psalm lxxxv. 10, 11.

[d] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [e] Heb. xi. 1—7.

Digitized by Google

attributes, they could look upon Him in His works; and in any revelation He might make of Himself they could "walk with God" and so "enter into His rest." But without this knowledge of Him and faith in Him as He has revealed Himself in His Word, it is impossible for sinful man to look upon Him without terror, without "the fear that hath torment."[f] When without this knowledge, gathered from the Scriptures, such a person gazes with intelligence and, it may be, with admiration on any of the works of creation, his mind rests on the work itself. He either thinks nothing of the Creator, or he satisfies himself with some vague notion of a First Cause or of a Supreme Being. Nothing is thought, nothing is known, of the end and purpose for which all things were created. Nothing is thought of the relation of the individual man to God, nor of the question, whether before that God he himself stands accepted or condemned.

On the other hand, the believer, the man "into whose heart the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ has shined," and who through the power of the Holy Ghost sees that light shining on every part of God's Word, and through it on the works of the visible creation, such a man is led up from the work, whether of Creation, or of Providence, or of Grace, to Him who wrought it. For instance, when he reads or hears the wonders recorded in Genesis i., he calls to mind the revelation that all those marvellous works were but a step in the purposes of God towards the manifestation of His glory in the Incarnation, the work, the salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ. He who wrought all those works has in that dispensation, for which they prepared the way, manifested His holiness and His love, His truth and His mercy: that mercy—the mercy of the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth —is high as the heavens above the earth. As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him. "He has loved them with an everlasting love."[g]

On the other hand, when the believer in the inspired Word of God looks upon the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ as there recorded, he looks back to the very beginning of the revelation, and says within himself: "This same Jesus, who was contented to be betrayed into the hands of wicked men, and crucified, and slain, is He 'who created all things by the word of His power, who upholds all things,' and 'by Whom all things consist.'"

It is in believing meditations like these that peace of soul is obtained, with "quietness and assurance for ever." It is thus

---

[f] 1 John iv. 18. [g] Psalm ciii. 11—13; Jeremiah xxxi. 3.

Digitized by Google

that believers "enter into rest."[h] The "rest,"[i] or Sabbath keeping, which remaineth "to the people of God, is of a spiritual nature like this, and is a foretaste of that rest into which our great High Priest, even Jesus, the Son of God, hath for us entered." Let the Sabbath be thus "esteemed a delight;" let there be not only a ceasing from their own words, and works, and pleasure, but a delight in the contemplation of God's works, and in acts of adoration, and prayer, and praise; and the promise is sure that then men shall "delight themselves in the Lord." He will give them the fulness of His blessing, even the mercy of the Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.

Surely it was in spiritual efforts such as these that the psalmist worshipped God, and found light, and peace, and strength. See how, in Psalm cxxxviii., while he gazes on the majesty and glory of Jehovah, he worships towards His holy temple, and praises *His name for His loving-kindness and for His truth;* and that because He had magnified His Word,—that is, His promise,—above all, *His name.* Observe this again, in Psalm xcii., which is entitled, a "Psalm or song for the Sabbath Day." In one part the writer says, "For Thou, Lord, hast made me glad through Thy work; I will triumph in the works of Thy hands." But at the opening, he says, "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto *Thy name,* oh Most High; to show forth Thy *loving-kindness* in the morning, and Thy *faithfulness* every night!"

Yes: and in these days it will, with the true believer, be the same. He will esteem the Sabbath a delight, as a season for special contemplation of the word and works of God. Such contemplation will excite him to thanksgiving and praise. He will delight in giving humble and hearty thanks to God for "his *creation, and preservation,* and all the blessings of this life; but above all, for God's inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, and for the hope of glory in Him." And the time, it is to be hoped, is not far distant when every true and consistent believer will *delight in the Sabbath,* as affording him especial opportunities for praising God,—by showing His glory to others, and by teaching others, whether young or old, to know Him and to glorify Him.

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION.

CHRISTIANITY is once again summoned into court, and required to prove its claim to be a Divine revelation, a supernatural religion. The case has been tried before, and decided in favour

[h] Heb. iv. 3. [i] Heb. iv. 9.

Digitized by Google

of the defendant; but it is now alleged that the evidence produced was defective, that it was never submitted to cross-examination, that it was not such as to satisfy a jury free from all bias. Accordingly application is made for a new trial, which the defendant's friends are disposed to grant. If I may be allowed for the nonce to act as counsel, although by no means learned in the law, I will do my best for my client. My first duty will be to review the former evidence, and to determine how far it will be expedient to reproduce it. It may be evidence quite satisfactory to my own mind, it may seem to amount to a moral certainty; but the question is, does it amount to legal evidence? Will it satisfy a jury? Will it bear to be tested by laws of evidence such as obtain in a civil court? May there not be some missing link, or some hidden flaw, which the counsel on the other side will be sure to detect? If so, it may be expedient to adopt a different line of defence; or it may be possible to strengthen the former case with other evidence,—not that I have the presumption to think that I have made fresh discoveries,—but there may be other evidence forthcoming which was overlooked before, or which had not its due prominence assigned to it.

The case of the defendant is this: that its author, Christ, although human, was also a Divine person, to wit, verily and indeed the Son of God, and therefore entitled to speak with Divine authority. If this can be proved, then Christianity clearly makes out its claim to be a Divine revelation. The main fact hitherto alleged in support of this claim is, that Christ wrought works of superhuman power, which in the former pleadings are called *miracles*. Now what has to be proved is, *first*, that the works (assumed to be supernatural) attributed to Christ, were actually wrought by Him; and, *secondly*, that such works could be wrought by none other than a Divine person. These two points will have to be considered in order.

I. Did Christ actually perform the works that are attributed to Him? The evidence is in the main documentary. Here are four documents, called Gospels, purporting to be memoirs of Christ's life, of His doings and sayings. For convenience I will designate them Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. On the part of the defence it is alleged that these are original, independent records. They all, in more or less detail, record certain acts, which are universally admitted to be acts of superhuman power, as wrought by Christ. According to our opponents the records do not agree; they often narrate apparently the same acts with such differences of statement as amount to contradictions, whereby their testimony is thus far damaged. I however am not afraid to submit to the jury that these very differences,—discrepancies let them be

Digitized by Google

called,—are indications of veracity; proofs of honest, independent testimony. But are the writers of these documents known? Do they profess to be eye-witnesses of the facts which they record? It must be confessed that, with one exception, that of No. 4, they do not so profess. One, the author of No. 3, acknowledges that he received his information at second-hand; from those, however, who were eye-witnesses. It must be confessed, moreover, that the documents themselves do not, in any one case, record the names of the writers: we must, therefore, look to other quarters for proof of their authorship. There is evidence to show that No. 1 was written by Matthew, one of the immediate disciples of Christ, therefore unquestionably an eye-witness of His acts. With regard to No. 2, there is an early and ever current tradition, which may be taken as evidence, that it was written by one, not himself an eye-witness, but who derived his materials from one of the most prominent actors in the scenes therein described. No. 3 has been already alluded to. No. 4 contains a passage, near its close, which seems to identify the writer with another prominent actor, the Apostle John. Immediately after a reference to "the disciple whom Jesus loved," it says, "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true." It must be acknowledged, however, that the concluding words, "we know that his testimony is true" warrant the suspicion that this is a postscript from another hand. For the defence it is alleged that Nos. 1, 2, and 3 contain the strongest internal evidence of belonging to the age and country in which their scenes are laid, of having been written by Jews of Palestine in the first century of the Christian era. No. 4 may be admitted to present diversities both of matter and style which require independent consideration. But further, in respect of all four, it is unquestionable that from the middle of the second century they begin to be cited as the works of the writers whose names they now bear, by authorities that are beyond all dispute. We now turn to the arguments on the other side. It is alleged, *first*, that the documents themselves are anonymous; that the evidence in favour of a Gospel written by Matthew goes rather to show that it was written in his native tongue, Syro-Chaldee, and therefore that the document now produced, in Greek, not being the original, cannot be put in as evidence; that Nos. 2 and 3 are confessedly not the testimonies of eye-witnesses. No. 4, as intimated, I purpose not to deal with. *Secondly*, that the documents themselves afford no clue whatever as to the times when they were respectively written; that by common consent they were not written until at least a generation of men had passed away after the date of the latest event therein recorded; that

Digitized by Google

they were not recognised until about the middle of the second century, *i.e.*, until after the lapse of a century from the date of the last recorded event. Such are briefly the allegations on either side on the first point of controversy. But, without stopping to examine and weigh them, I proceed to consider the second point.

II. Assuming that the works of superhuman power attributed to Christ in these narratives were actually wrought by Him, are they such as could only be wrought by a Divine person? Are they such as in themselves to afford conclusive evidence of a Divine revelation? Now upon this point, taking, as we must necessarily do, the sacred Scriptures as our guide, we are constrained to acknowledge, *first*, that we find works of power similar to those wrought by our Lord,—yea, even what to our apprehension is the mightiest of all His works, the restoration of the dead to life,—attributed to mere men: *e.g.*, the prophet Elijah. And not only so, but what is still more important to observe; *secondly*, we find miracles ascribed to false prophets, as well as to true; to Satanic agency, as well as to Divine. We find, to quote the words of Archbishop Trench, "that the kingdom of lies has its wonders, as well as the kingdom of truth." This fact, then, seems of itself to be sufficient evidence that miracles cannot with safety be relied on, "cannot be appealed to absolutely and finally in proof of a Divine revelation."

Here I venture to digress for a moment. It will perhaps be observed that I make a distinction between works of power and miracles, and that by the former term only I designate the works of our Lord. I do so advisedly. The term "miracles" I take to be the equivalent of "signs and wonders" (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*), and by such term the evangelists in no one instance designate our Lord's acts of power. I say this with a perfect recollection of Peter's words, as recorded in the Acts: "A man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs," as well as of the fact that Nicodemus applied the term to our Lord's works. Again, by the term "signs" (*σημεῖα*), I understand acts performed for a certain object: viz., in attestation of a mission or a doctrine. I venture to affirm that our Lord nowhere appeals to His works of power as attesting His mission or His doctrine, and the words recorded in the fourth Gospel which seem to bear this construction, are, I believe, commonly misunderstood. Moreover, I rely on our Lord's own express disclaimer: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, but there shall no sign be given them."

Returning from this digression, for the reasons above intimated, if I am to conduct the case on behalf of the defendant, I shall not attempt to bring forward, at all events *at first*,—I shall not put in the forefront of my argument, the so-called evidence of

Digitized by Google

miracles. My first step, on coming into court, will be to call a witness,—a living witness,—to whose evidence I attach the utmost importance: I mean the Christian Church; or, to use a perhaps more convenient designation, Christendom. Here is a living power, a mighty organization, comprehending numerically one third of the human race; I say numerically, but adopting any other standard, physical, intellectual, moral, social, or political, I need not hesitate to affirm that it comprehends the greatest and best part of mankind. This power has existed for nearly eighteen centuries, tracing its descent unbroken from the author of the revelation in question. It has achieved the mightiest results of which the world has record. It subdued the Roman Empire; it has subjugated all the most powerful races of mankind; it has renovated, and is still advancing to renovate the world. The enemies of Christianity may aver that it is effete, but we challenge them to the proof. In no age of its existence has Christendom exhibited clearer signs of vital energy, than it does at present. But if the continued existence and prevalence of the Christian system be adduced in evidence of its Divine origin, our opponents will probably call in the other religious systems, which claim the allegiance of still larger masses of mankind: *e.g.*, Mohammedanism, Brahminism, Buddhism. I do not object to this; let them be called in and examined. Assuming their vitality (which by the bye, in the case of Brahminism, I deny, for I know it to be dying out), whatever vitality they possess, they possess by virtue of some vital principle, and that vital principle must necessarily be an element of truth. Nothing but truth has real life, or can impart life to any system. That element of truth may indeed be overlaid by successive accretions of error, and then the system will die sooner or later. Now Mohammedanism still lives, because it witnesses for a great truth,—the unity of the Godhead; *that* is its vital principle. Buddhism still lives, because it proclaims the true end of man to be the extinction of the rebellious personal will, and the attainment of perfect harmony with the will of God; that is *its* vital principle. Now it may be urged that Christianity embodies both these great principles; but this statement alone will not suffice for its paramount and exclusive claims. It will be necessary to inquire wherein it differs from all other systems: what is its characteristic feature, its *differentia*.

The examination of our witness brings out in evidence this important fact, that it (this living power, Christendom) is the direct *issue of the Gospel which Paul preached*. I must endeavour to make this point clear. It is abundantly evident that Christianity at the outset assumed a Jewish type; necessarily so, for its original centre was Jerusalem, its first Apostles were Jews

Digitized by Google

of Palestine, and in their hands, in all human probability, it would never have assumed any other form than a higher form of Judaism. We have no evidence, unless it be in the case of John, and perhaps[a] Peter, that their influence extended,—nor have we any reliable evidence whatever that they, any of them, founded a Church,—beyond the limits of Judaism. It was in the hands of Saul of Tarsus that Christianity became a world-embracing faith. It was he, the Roman citizen as well as Jew, with the education, so to speak, of a man of the world, who was "the chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentiles and Kings," as well as the children of Israel. Look at the great centres from which Christianity radiated: Antioch, the capital of Syria and the East; Ephesus, the capital of proconsular Asia; Corinth, the then capital of Greece; Rome, the metropolis of the world. In them all we find Paul's influence predominant. It was he, and none but he. With the only remaining great centre of propagation, Alexandria, we do not know that Paul had any direct connection; but if, as I think, Augustine may be taken as a representative of the African Churches, Augustine, of all men, was a disciple of Paul. It was through Paul's preaching, then, that "God caused the light of the Gospel to shine throughout the world;" and as a necessary consequence, the Christianity which was the result of his teaching, bore the impress of his mind, was informed by his spirit. It is to his doctrine, therefore, that we must look for the vital principle of Christianity. I may add, that the characteristic feature of the Reformation was the reassertion of Pauline doctrine. Whatever results therefore may be ascribed to this event,—if, as I believe, it was in any sense the revival of Christianity in its earlier and purer form,—those results are due to the vital element in that doctrine. Now what is it that lies at the root,—that forms the basis of all St. Paul's teaching and preaching? I reply, beyond a question, *the historical fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead.* It will surely be unnecessary for me to quote in support of this position. Suffice it to say, that St. Paul stakes everything upon that fact: "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."

We have arrived then at this point: we have established, to the satisfaction (I hope) of a rational, intelligent jury, that the living power now in the witness box, the greatest power that the world has yet seen,—with all its mighty results, the greatest in man's history,—is the direct issue of the Gospel which Paul preached; and that the central, vital element of that Gospel is the historic fact therein proclaimed,—the fact of Christ's

[a] We cannot assent to this possible exception of Peter. (See Gal. ii. 7.) [Ed.]

Digitized by Google

utmost importance: I mean the Christian
perhaps more convenient designation, Chris
living power, a mighty organization, compr
one third of the human race; I say nu
any other standard, physical, intelle
political, I need not hesitate to affir
greatest and best part of mankind.
nearly eighteen centuries, tracing it
author of the revelation in qu
mightiest results of which the
the Roman Empire; it has s
races of mankind; it has re
renovate the world. The en
it is effete, but we challen
its existence has Christe
energy, than it does at p
and prevalence of the
of its Divine origin,
other religious syst
larger masses of m
Buddhism. I do
examined. Assu
case of Brahmi
whatever vital
vital princip
element of
life to any
laid by su
die soon
it witn
its vi
the
son
of
C

ve been
two letters
to them: the
ventured to impugn
r is there any question
e acknowledged to be the
nese two can be proved, from
written within twenty-five years
ow, in the first Epistle we have
ne Gospel which he preached: it is
words, "How that Christ died for our
Scriptures, and that He was buried, and
the third day according to the Scriptures."
ve have the earliest Christian creed, comprised
—we may, perhaps, venture to say in two,—each
g a simple historical fact (as alleged): Christ's
Christ's resurrection. The first was patent to all the
the second, from the nature of the case, could not be so
known; but the Apostle goes on distinctly to state to
extent it was known: "He was seen of Cephas, then of
twelve: after that, He was seen of above *five hundred*
at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this
present, but some are fallen asleep." Now, let this sentence be
weighed. The Apostle here states, of his own personal
knowledge, that at the time of his writing this letter there were
still living (say) three hundred eye-witnesses of the resurrection.
Would he have dared to make this statement, if he did not know
it to be true? It was made in a letter addressed to a whole
community. Would there not have been some to call it in
question, if it were not believed to be true? It was a statement
publicly made; and that not to credulous Jews, but to curious,
inquiring Greeks. Would there not have been some to make
inquiries, if it had not been made on apparently good grounds?
St. Paul had opponents in abundance at Corinth, ready enough
to dispute his *dicta*. Above all, there was a Jewish party ques-

Digitized by Google

indication that either the writer's facts, or the testimony to which he had appealed, were called in question. I produce further the letter, all but universally admitted to be genuine, of at least one of those hundreds of eye-witnesses to whom he appealed (St. Peter), wherein the alleged fact is clearly attested. I contend that the evidence is conclusive, and that no better evidence—I doubt if any half so clear—can be adduced in proof of any single event which is believed to have occurred in an age so remote: I have strong confidence that this is evidence which will be received by the jury.

But the resurrection of Christ is acknowledged to be a supernatural event; and but for this circumstance (it is important to observe), but for the fact of its supernatural character, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt it would never have been disputed. Here, then, it will be necessary to glance at the *a priori* argument on the other side. It is argued that such are the antecedent improbabilities of an occurrence like the resurrection, that no amount of evidence can be received in its favour. If this argument be valid, here is of course an end of the matter. But what are these improbabilities?

First, that *it is contrary to all human experience.* But this is part of our case; it forms the prominent feature in our case: we affirm that a resurrection, like that of our Lord, is an event *unique* in the world's history; that it never happened before, and cannot happen again until the end of time. "Jesus is the first begotten of the dead." Do our opponents mean to argue, that no evidence can be received in favour of an event which is alleged to have happened for the first time in the world's history? Let us take the case of this last Arctic expedition; suppose that some three or four years hence Captain Nares returns with some two or three of his companions,—his ships lost, and all the results of his observations lost with them,—and reports that he actually reached the North Pole, and saw the Pole star vertical over his head; is he not to be believed? Suppose, moreover, the difficulties which he had to encounter, and the dangers to which he was exposed, to have been such as absolutely to forbid all future attempts to repeat the experiment. This is not an utterly improbable case. His testimony then becomes contrary to all human experience; is it therefore to be rejected for all time?

But, *secondly*, it is said, an event like the resurrection is *in violation of the fixed laws of nature.* This we utterly deny; on the contrary, we affirm that life out of death is a great and ever recurring fact of nature,—is a law of nature: that every returning spring bears witness to a resurrection in the vegetable world; and that there are not wanting corresponding analogies in the

Digitized by Google

animal world likewise,—to say nothing now of the instinctive hopes and yearnings of the common heart of man, all tending in the same direction. We, therefore, emphatically deny,—and our denial is quite as good as their assertion,—we deny that in the case of Christ's resurrection from the dead there are such antecedent improbabilities as ought to weigh against the positive evidence which we have produced, that it actually occurred.

This then is our case; and we claim to have made out satisfactorily, and in perfect conformity with the laws of evidence, that our religion, being a supernatural religion,—inasmuch as a supernatural event, Christ's resurrection, forms its central, vital element,—is worthy of all credit. This supernatural event may, perhaps, fitly be called a miracle; but it clearly does not belong to the same category with the other so-called miracles, viz., the works of superhuman power wrought by Christ. It is doubtless a sign, but a sign *per se;* and, what it is important to observe, it is the *very* sign, and that the only sign, which our Lord vouchsafed to His generation: "There shall no sign be given it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas; for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." I am warranted, therefore, in resting the case of Christianity upon the evidence connected with *this* sign.

From this point I advance a step further. The resurrection involves, logically involves, another supernatural element of Christianity; it is a proof *a posteriori* of the incarnation. Thus argues St. Paul: "Christ was declared,"—determined, proved (ὁρισθέντος),—"to be the Son of God, by the resurrection from the dead;" proved *ex ipso facto.* It will be needless for me to attempt to expand the argument, for our opponents, I apprehend, are prepared to concede that if Christ actually rose from the dead, His divinity follows, if not as a matter of course, yet as a very probable inference. I conceive, therefore, that our case is now fully proved. Christianity is a Divine revelation. It is "the manifestation of the grace of God in the appearing of Jesus Christ" in His incarnation, resurrection, and ascension,—the great supernatural events of the Gospel history.

We are now able to assign to the works ascribed to Christ their due place in the Christian system. Whether or not it can be proved to the satisfaction of a jury that He actually wrought them, this at least is capable of proof, that they are in entire harmony with the character which He assumes in the narrative. He claims to be the Messiah, for whom the Jewish people had been looking throughout the whole period of their history. The character and functions of this Messiah are thus delineated in Hebrew prophecy: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because

Digitized by Google

He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captive, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Accordingly at the very outset of His public career we find Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth, citing this prophecy and applying it to Himself: "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Thus He announces Himself to His countrymen as the Healer, the Deliverer, the Redeemer, such as the Messiah was to be for whom they had been looking. He goes forth on His mission; His acts henceforth are in entire conformity to His character and office. His works are not wrought with a view to display His power, nor, as Moses wrought signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, to authenticate His mission; but when and wheresoever circumstances called into exercise the functions of His office, when and wheresoever meet objects of His compassion presented themselves,—and this would necessarily be whenever He came in contact with His fellow-men,—then and there we find Him doing acts of mercy, acts of healing, acts of deliverance, for poor afflicted humanity: "virtue went out of Him, and He healed them all." Again, at another crisis of His career, when the fact of His Messiahship seemed for a moment to be questioned, though certainly in no adverse spirit, by His great contemporary John Baptist, his reply to the Baptist's messengers was, "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them;" in other words, "Go and tell John that ye have seen the putting forth of a power which is eventually to deliver a death-stricken world: is not this the Messiah?" But a complete deliverance for man, such as would be alone commensurate with a Divine purpose, must needs be a deliverance from the power of evil in all its forms, physical and moral. Moral evil is the fountain-head of human suffering, and to cure this demands a more than human physician; to destroy the works of the devil demands a more than human might.

My argument then is this: the promised Messiah was destined to be the Healer, Deliverer, and Redeemer of man's race; but in order fully to meet the exigencies of the case, He must be able to deliver man from the power of evil. For this a Divine Messiah could alone suffice; David's son must needs be David's Lord. This Jesus Christ is proved to be "by the resurrection from the dead:" thereby "declared to be the Son of God with power." As such, therefore, He *does* meet the exigencies of the case. The acts ascribed to Jesus Christ in the Gospel narrative are in entire harmony with the character and functions of a Divine

Digitized by Google

Messiah, such as He is proved to be. They are redemptive acts, such as might be expected from a Redeemer of man; they are acts of superhuman power, such as a Divine Redeemer can perform: *therefore* we receive them, and put implicit credence in them.

The *genesis* of our faith then is this: not that we believe in Jesus because of the works that are ascribed to Him; but, because we believe in Jesus as the Son of God, we give entire credence to the works ascribed to Him, seeing that they are just such works as are suitable for a Divine Redeemer to perform. In refuting the arguments of modern sceptics it follows that the attempt to prove a Divine revelation from the evidence of miracles (as the term is commonly understood[b]) is a beginning at the wrong end.

It will be evident that this paper was suggested by the work bearing the same title, which has lately created so painful a sensation amongst us. This apparently formidable engine, imported form Germany, is intended, it would seem, to bombard the citadel of Christianity; hitherto, however, the assault has been confined to the outworks, where the author has found more than his match in Professor Lightfoot. But the defenders of a fortress, when preparing for a siege, find it often necessary to begin with the work of demolition. They carefully survey the outer defences, built in former days, and those which are found tenable are secured and manned; the rest are abandoned. Everything outside the walls which is judged not perfectly capable of defence, every building likely to afford a lodgment to the foe is demolished: elegant villas, trim gardens, pleasant groves,—all that has grown up about the fortress in times of security, elaborated, perhaps, with much skill, and art, and taste, is ruthlessly swept away. It may be that there are some things of this character in what the author of "Supernatural Religion" calls Ecclesiastical Christianity,—some things that are not of the essence of Christianity pure and simple, which will need to be sacrified to the exigencies of the impending struggle;—some points, also, in the outer lines of defence, constructed in times past by Christian apologists and writers on evidences, which they believed to be not only serviceable but sound, and which then actually served their purpose, but which are now found to be barely tenable, and had therefore better be abandoned. Let

[b] It is to be lamented that the one word "miracles" is made to stand for three distinct classes of *phenomena*; viz. (1): "signs" in attestation of a mission, such as those wrought by Moses in the land of Egypt; (2) the redemptive acts of Jesus as the Messiah; (3) the supernatural events of our Lord's history, *e.g.*, the resurrection. This is one of many instances in which confusion of language has led to serious error; the word "priest" affording another notable example.

Digitized by Google

us entrench ourselves only the more securely within the walls of the citadel. Those walls are built up of the great central facts of our redemption,—the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension of our Lord; and the key to the position is the resurrection: until that key is taken, Christianity is safe.

J. R.

THE HOLY BIBLE.

The Holy Bible, according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen. Vol. V. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations. J. Murray. 1875.

It will be within the recollection of our readers that our examination of the fifth volume of the "Speaker's Commentary" was restricted to that portion of it for which we are indebted to the pen of Dr. Kay. In resuming our subject we propose to direct the attention of our readers to the remaining portion of the volume before us, which contains the Dean of Canterbury's Commentary upon the writings of the Prophet Jeremiah.

Jeremiah was, in every respect, one of the most remarkable of that "goodly fellowship of prophets" in which his name is enrolled, and in which it has, in all ages, occupied a position of high pre-eminence. There is much truth in the remark of Dr. Payne Smith, that the "whole subject of Hebrew names requires more careful treatment than it has hitherto met with;" and the various explanations which have been suggested of that of the Prophet Jeremiah is a sufficient elucidation of the justice of that observation. The name appears to have been in common use from the time of David (*e.g.*, 1 Chron. v. 24; xii. 4, 10, 13, etc.), and to have denoted, in accordance with the *Chaldee* signification of the verb *ramah*, one whom Jehovah appointed; but probably, in accordance with its original idea, as derived from the verb *rum*, one raised up or exalted by Jehovah.

It has been a subject of dispute whether Hilkiah, the father of Jeremiah, was, or was not, identical with the high priest of that name, who found the book of the law in the house of the Lord in the days of King Josiah. (2 Kings xxii. 8.) In favour of this supposition may fairly be alleged, as by the Dean of Canterbury, the respect which was shown for the Prophet by Jehoiakim and by Zedekiah, and generally by the principal nobles of the land, and also by the Chaldeans, whilst the objections, based on the absence of any express reference to his

Digitized by Google

father's office, in Jer. i. 1, and on his residence, or that of his ancestors, at Anathoth, appear to be either founded on misapprehension, or to be capable of easy explanation. On the other hand, the fact that the name *Hilkiah*, as well as that of Jeremiah, was one of not uncommon occurrence, coupled with the total absence of all direct evidence as to the priestly rank of the Prophet's father, will suffice to show that no positive conclusion can be arrived at upon this point.

The call of Jeremiah to the prophetical office appears to have been received when he was yet of tender age. The thirteenth year of the reign of King Josiah was a time when the danger of foreign invasion, similar to that which had been experienced in the days of Hezekiah, was again threatening the kingdom of Judah. When Dr. Payne Smith speaks of a "more directly political position" being assigned to Jeremiah than to any other of the ancient Prophets, we presume that he refers to those only of that "goodly fellowship" whose lot was cast within the confines of Palestine. We can only surmise what political distinctions might have been reserved for Jeremiah, at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, had he accepted the invitation of Nebuzar-adan, "the captain of the guard," and accompanied that officer into Babylon (Jer. xl. 2); but, as a matter of fact, whilst the Prophet Daniel occupied the highest political post at the court of a heathen king, the Prophet Jeremiah appears, neither at the court of his own Sovereign nor at that of any heathen Monarch, to have been invested with any directly political character, but only to have exercised influence of the same nature, though probably not of the same extent, as that which had been exercised by his illustrious predecessor, Isaiah, during the reign of King Hezekiah. We refer to this point the rather because, whilst we would by no means deny that Jeremiah may, and, in all probability, did exercise very great influence in the kingdom of Judah during the reign of the good King Josiah, it is somewhat remarkable that we find no direct mention made of his name in connection with the most sweeping work of reformation by which that reign was distinguished.

There is much interesting information contained in that section of the Dean of Canterbury's Introduction to the book of Jeremiah, which is entitled, "Political State of Affairs." Adopting an entirely different estimate from that of Dr. Kay, regarding the value of the discoveries of recent Assyriologists, Dr. Payne Smith does not hesitate to make free use of the decipherments of the inscriptions which have been already examined, and to express his conviction that they are "throwing a flood of light upon the Assyrian period of Jewish history." One of the results of this conflict of opinion has been the

Digitized by Google

adoption of very different conclusions by the two writers respecting the chronology of some great events of Jewish history, more particularly respecting the exact date of the destruction of Sennacherib's army. Dr. Kay not only confidently assigns the date 710 B.C. to this event, but traces, with great minuteness, its chronological relation to other great events in sacred and profane history. Dr. Payne Smith, on the other hand, affirms, with equal confidence, that Sennacherib did not come to the throne till 703 B.C., and consequently that the army of that King could not have been destroyed seven years previously. It is not unworthy of observation, however, as an indication of the extreme uncertainty which still attaches to the conclusions of critics as to the chronology of the Assyrian era, that while Professor Rawlinson, in his Commentary on 2 Kings xviii., regards the "fourteenth year" of Hezekiah (v. 13) either as an interpolation, or a false reading, or as referring to an expedition of Sargon, not of Sennacherib, Dr. Payne Smith, on the contrary, considers that that date is by all means to be retained as "the safe connecting link between the chronology of the Bible and that of the cuneiform inscriptions." We do not for a moment suppose that the great diversities of opinion on this, as on other points of chronology, which appear in the "Speaker's Commentary," have escaped the vigilant eye of the learned and accomplished Editor. We presume that he considered it due to the position and reputation of the several contributors that they should be allowed, in the freest manner, and to the fullest extent, to give to the world the results of their several independent researches. We are disposed, however, to think that there are few services which Canon Cook could render with greater advantage to his readers than by furnishing them with a comprehensive survey of the various arguments by which the conflicting opinions expressed in the Commentary respecting the chronology of some of the great events of Jewish history have been maintained, and of the conclusions at which he has himself arrived on a subject of such extremely great and increasing importance.

But, whatever difficulties may attend the determination of the precise dates of events, such as that of Sennacherib's invasion of Judæa in the days of Hezekiah, the general outline of the political history of the two great rival powers, Assyria and Egypt, and from a date shortly subsequent to the battle of Megiddo, of Babylon and of Egypt, from the time of Hezekiah to that of Josiah, is now tolerably clear; and its right understanding is, as Dr. Payne Smith contends, of considerable importance to those who would form a just estimate of the nature of the work and ministry of the Prophet Jeremiah, and of the peculiar diffi-

Digitized by Google

culties with which he was called to contend. Esar-haddon, the son and successor of Sennacherib, appears to have been one of the most powerful Kings of Nineveh. The Assyrian inscriptions corroborate, in one remarkable particular, the accuracy of the Biblical narrative, in that whilst the latter represents Manasseh as having been carried by an Assyrian army to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11), the cylinders brought from the palace of Esar-haddon contain evidence that for upwards of eleven years that Monarch made Babylon the place of his residence,—no other instance being known in which an Assyrian King resided at Babylon.

From the same sources we learn that Assurbanipal, whom Dr. Payne Smith is inclined to identify with "the great and noble Asnapper" of Ezra (iv. 10), transplanted Elamites into the empty cities of Samaria; whilst, in accordance with the general tenor of the Biblical records of that period, no mention is made of any interference with the land of Judæa.

But towards the end of the reign of Josiah the political horizon of Judæa began to be obscured. Psammetichus, the King of Egypt, had succeeded in uniting under his own vigorous sway the twelve petty principalities into which that country had recently been divided by the policy of Assurbanipal. The power of Assyria was now rapidly declining, and about two years after the battle of Megiddo, in which King Josiah was slain, Nineveh fell before the combined attack of the Medes, under Cyaxares, and the Babylonians, under Nabopalassar. In the year 586 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabopalassar, defeated Necho, the King of Egypt and successor of Psammetichus at Carchemish, and began that career of conquest which established the short-lived supremacy of Babylon.

This brief sketch of the times in which Jeremiah lived, if we may rely on the sources from which it is, to a great extent, derived, will go far towards explaining the peculiar difficulties by which the Prophet found himself encompassed, and towards exposing the groundless nature of the objections of Maurer and Knobel, based upon the supposition that no Egyptian party could have existed in Jerusalem in the days in which Jeremiah lived. "The statesmen of Judah," Dr. Payne Smith observes, "were not so dull as not to see the political importance of the consolidation of Egypt into one empire, and we may well imagine that the question of a close alliance with Psammetichus was often debated in the councils of Josiah."

The opening years of the reign of Jehoiakim constituted one of the most critical epochs of Jewish history. Nineveh, the old enemy and oppressor of God's people, was now fallen. Babylon had but recently achieved her independence; and the strength of Egypt, the dominant power, was not subdued until the fourth

Digitized by Google

year of Jehoiakim's reign, and Jehoiakim appears to have been the willing vassal of its King. "No wonder," observes Dean Payne Smith, "that, being an irreligious man, he scorned all Jeremiah's predictions of utter and early ruin. No wonder that he destroyed Jeremiah's roll, as the record of the outpourings of mere fanaticism. It was his last chance, his last offer of mercy; and as he threw the torn fragments of the roll on the fire, he threw there in symbol his royal house, his doomed city, the temple, and all the people of the land."

The moral state of the Jewish nation is justly described by the Dean of Canterbury as one of great and general depravity. The reforms of the good King Hezekiah appear to have taken but little root in the hearts of the people. Whether we assign the date of the first chapter of Isaiah's prophecies, with Dr. Kay, to the reign of Uzziah, or with the Dean of Canterbury, to a date subsequent to the reformation of King Hezekiah, we agree with the latter writer that the description of the people contained in that chapter was but too applicable to the later as well as to the earlier date to which the words of the prophet have been assigned, and that "the whole head was sick, and the whole heart faint."

The reign of Manasseh was signalized not only by the open prevalence of idolatry, but also by the combined endeavours of the King and the nation to extirpate the worship of Jehovah. The idolatrous worship, too successfully established by Manasseh, was continued by his son Amon, of whom it is recorded that "he humbled not himself before the Lord, as Manasseh his father had humbled himself; but Amon trespassed more and more."

During the early part of the reign of King Josiah, the nation appears to have gradually recovered from the outburst of idolatry; and in the eighteenth year of his reign, when the memorable discovery was made of the book of the law, the young King devoted his whole heart and influence to the restoration of the national religion, and the extirpation of idolatrous worship.

Five years previously to this period the appointment of Jeremiah to the prophetical office appears to have taken place. The character of the prophet, alike in its weakness and in its strength, is graphically described by the Dean of Canterbury. It would be difficult to conceive of any human instrument apparently more unsuited for his appointed work, than was the prophet Jeremiah for that to which God called him. A man of a timid, retiring, and even desponding disposition, was ordained to be "a man of strife, and a man of contention to the whole earth." But in all ages God has been pleased to choose "the weak things of the world to confound the mighty;" and wherever

Digitized by Google

His servants have gone forth to their appointed work, relying not on their own strength, but on the strength of Him who has sent them, the promised grace has been found sufficient for them, and the Divine strength has been made perfect in human weakness. It was thus in the case of the prophet Jeremiah. "Judged," the Dean of Canterbury writes, "by his own estimate of himself, "he was feeble, and his mission a failure; really, in the hour of action, and when duty called him, he was in very truth 'a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls against the whole land.' (Ch. i. 18.)"

Our space will not permit us to enter upon the interesting but difficult question of the arrangement of Jeremiah's prophecies. We may observe, however, that the Dean of Canterbury's opinion is that the prophet had proposed to himself to gather into one volume all his prophecies, but that he died in Egypt before he had accomplished his design; and that Baruch, or whoever had charge of his writings, "did not feel himself at liberty to attempt any arrangement of them." We may add, moreover, that it is the opinion of Graf, who has carefully examined the most important variations in the Septuagint version, that it is impossible "to draw from it any conclusion as to the Hebrew text having ever existed in a different form from that in which we have it at present."

The Commentary on Jeremiah bears evidence of a careful examination of the original text, by one whose acquaintance with Hebrew and with the cognate languages is well known. It bears witness also to the extensive reading and the discriminating judgment of the writer. In some places we think we detect traces of undue haste, and also of carelessness in composition; *e.g.*, in the Introduction we find no antecedent to the words "they held" (p. 314), but "the Scythian invasion" of the preceding clause. We do not think the phrase, "Josiah's death honourably in battle" (p. 315), strictly grammatical; and the statement that Jeremiah "not only had in his service a scribe, but one who was a high noble" (p. 312), appears to us to be open to the ambiguity whether the reference is to two distinct persons, or, as the context shows, only to one. These, however, are but points of minor importance, and are capable of easy correction in the future editions through which this Commentary is destined to pass.

The Dean of Canterbury appears to us to have encountered the chief difficulties of his undertaking without shrinking, as many of his predecessors in the work of exegesis have done, either from fairly grappling with them, or from frankly communicating to his readers the results of his laborious investigations; and if we are not always satisfied with the conclusions

Digitized by Google

at which he has arrived, we cannot fail to admire the candour and the impartiality with which the search after truth has been conducted.

We may refer, by way of illustration, to our author's mode of dealing with Jer. vii. 21—23, one of those passages on which the negative school of critics lay much stress, as proving, in their judgment, that the sacrificial laws contained in the Pentateuch are the inventions of a late period of Jewish history. We will quote *in extenso* (omitting only the numerous references which occur in the note) the remarks of the Dean of Canterbury on this important subject. The passage itself is as follows: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Put your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you." On this passage the Dean remarks as follows:—

"22. This verse is put forward by many critics of the new school, in proof that God absolutely commanded no sacrifices whatsoever by the hand of Moses. Assuming this as Jeremiah's meaning, they infer (1) that all such portions of the Pentateuch as give directions for sacrifices, are forgeries of a later date; that (2) the Book of Deuteronomy, in which there are no minute directions about sacrifices, and which otherwise has much in common with the writings of Jeremiah, was that Prophet's own composition, and palmed off by him, acting in concert with Hilkiah and Shaphan, by a pious fraud upon the credulous Josiah; and that (3) it was only after the return from exile that the laws about the tabernacle, sacrifices, the great feasts, etc., were invented, and that Ezra was probably the person guilty of this deception. In answer to this assumption it would almost be sufficient to quote ch. xxxiii. 18, where Jeremiah says, 'Neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before Me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.' But this is not the only place where the hereditary right of the Levitical priesthood, and the three kinds of sacrifices appointed by the Mosaic law, are acknowledged; for Jeremiah repeatedly makes allusions to them. (See vi. 20; vii. 21; xiv. 12; xvii. 26; xxxiii. 21, 22.) Even more full are the allusions made by the older prophets, Hosea and Amos, who, between them, establish the existence both in Israel and Judah, of all the main particulars of the Mosaic law. Plainly, therefore, Jeremiah could not have meant that God gave no commandments concerning sacrifices when He brought the people out of Egypt: his meaning really is that sacrifices were not the object and purpose of the law, but obedience, as Samuel had taught long before. (1 Sam. xv. 22.)

Digitized by Google

Add that the severe manner in which the prophets condemn sacrifice when offered for its own sake (see Is. i. 11; Hosea vi. 6; viii. 11—13; Amos v. 21—27; Micah vi. 6—8), is a proof that the sacrificial system was a great and powerful institution, for otherwise men would not have trusted in it. Finally, the words of Jeremiah do not properly convey the sense which these critics endeavour to put upon them; for in the Hebrew, the phrase *concerning* (or as it is in the margin, *concerning the matter of*) *burnt offerings and sacrifices*, is *Al dib're olah wezebach:*[a] *i.e., as to matters of burnt offering, etc.* Now this means *for the sake of*, and is so translated in Deut. iv. 21, and so in Jer. xiv. 1, where the Authorized Version has *concerning;* and in Ps. vii., tit., where it is translated literally, it means, *because of*, or *with reference to* the dearth, *with reference to* Cush. A similar phrase, *Al d'bar*,[b] in 2 Sam. xviii 5, in conjunction with the same verb which is used here, means, 'He gave charge or commandment *with reference to* Absalom.' (See also Deut. xxii. 24, where it is rendered *because;* Eccl. iii. 18, *concerning the estate of*, where see note; and ib. viii. 2, *in regard of.*) Evidently, therefore, Jeremiah's words mean, not that God did not then institute sacrifices, but that He did not institute them for their own sakes: 'For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, because of (*i.e.*, for the sake of) burnt offerings and sacrifices.' In exact accordance with this, Maimonides distinguishes between laws of primary importance, enacted for their own sakes, and laws of secondary importance. (See Ps. l. 7—15.) The current exposition of the older commentators is best given by Kimchi, who points out that the decalogue, which was the basis of the whole law, and laid up in the ark as the bond of the covenant, contained no ritual ordinance except that of the Sabbath. Similarly, Jerome and Abravanel notice that the ceremonial law was only introduced after the people, by the worship of the golden calf, had proved themselves unworthy of a spiritual dispensation. And this was the view prevalent in the early Church. Unable from the daily sight of heathen worship to see that sacrifices had a right side, the early Christians classed them among the burdens of the law laid upon the Jews for their carnality. Until the rise, then, of the new school, commentators have all seen the true meaning of Jeremiah's words, namely, that God in instituting the ceremonial part of the Mosaic law, did so, not *for the sake* of having burnt offerings and sacrifices made unto Him, but for moral purposes. The explanation given by Henderson is also to the purpose, that it is not unfrequent in the Scriptures for a thing to be stated absolutely, which is true only relatively. Absolutely God did command sacrifices, but not such as they offered, nor as of final obligation. He notices also that the moral law was promulgated first, and with the utmost solemnity, upon Sinai; the ceremonial law only afterwards." (Pp. 376, 377.)

---

[a] These words are printed in Hebrew characters in the Commentary.

[b] See last note.

Digitized by Google

We should have perused with much pleasure any remarks from the pen of the Dean of Canterbury on the general question of the references contained in the prophecies of Jeremiah to the Book of Deuteronomy, and upon the insuperable difficulties involved in the modern theory of the composition of that Book, either by the prophet Jeremiah, or about his time. In any case we think our author would have done well to point out the palpable absurdity involved in the supposition that the same person who had recently forged the Book of Deuteronomy in the name of Moses, should have hazarded the assertion that God "absolutely commanded no sacrifices whatsoever by the hand of Moses." It is quite true, indeed, that the sacrificial directions contained in the Book of Deuteronomy, are, as the circumstances of its composition would suggest, not so minute as those in the Books of Exodus and Leviticus. On the other hand, it would have seemed absolutely impossible that any one who had read the 12th, the 14th, and the 16th chapters of Deuteronomy, and who maintained that that Book was composed in the days of Josiah, should affirm that "the laws about the tabernacle, sacrifices, the great feasts, etc.," were not "invented" until after the return from the Babylonish exile. If, then, it be manifest, beyond all doubt, that the Book of Deuteronomy expressly recognises the existence of the sacrificial system, and that the writer of that Book, whoever he may have been, designed his readers to believe that Moses was its author, or, in any case, that the laws therein contained were prescribed by Moses, and if, further,—as the Dean of Canterbury has abundantly proved,—the Prophet Jeremiah in many places alludes to the sacrificial system as administered by the Levitical priesthood, it follows, as a matter of necessity, either that the Prophet is altogether inconsistent with himself, or that he could not consciously and designedly have denied that sacrificial laws were instituted by Moses at the command of God.[c]

We would gladly have directed the attention of our readers to many other valuable and interesting notes, but our limits warn us that we must bring our notice of this Commentary to an end. We add, in conclusion, a few remarks upon some of the notes

[c] We may refer, in connection with this subject, to an admirable note in this Commentary, upon ch. viii. 8: "The pen of the scribes is in vain;" in which the Dean of Canterbury argues with much force, that there must have been in Jeremiah's time a body of men whose occupation consisted in the study of the law of Moses. Even if we were to admit, with many modern critics, that the word "scribes" refers in this place to the writers of books in which false prophecies were included, it may fairly be urged, with Keil, that the labours of these writers must have been based upon a law which already existed, and consequently that the modern theory respecting the fabrication of that law in the days of Josiah, is a groundless conceit.

Digitized by Google

which we should like to see amended in future editions of a work of standard reference.

(1) The notes on "Jeremiah" and "the Son of Hilkiah," in chap. i., are repeated, substantially, from the Introduction.

(2) In the Introduction to Jeremiah's second prophecy (p. 333), we are told that at the time at which this prophecy was delivered, "Egypt was a country just rising into power under the vigorous rule of Psammetichus." Now in the general introduction to the Prophecies of Jeremiah (p. 314), we are told that Psammetichus became sole master of Egypt in the twenty-fourth year of the reign of Manasseh. Inasmuch, then, as Manasseh reigned fifty-five years, and his son Amon two years, it can scarcely be said with strict accuracy that Egypt was "just rising into power" in the days of Josiah, at which time Dean Payne Smith considers that the prophecy in question was delivered.

(3) We demur to our author's rendering of the words rendered in the Authorized Version, "a plentiful country" (chap. ii. 7), when he tells us that the literal translation is "a land of the Carmel," or "a Carmel land." Dean Payne Smith is doubtless well aware that the particular grammatical form here employed is the only one by which "*the* land of the Carmel," or "*the* Carmel land," could be expressed in Hebrew, the word translated "land" being incapable of receiving the definite article. We are of opinion, therefore, that by printing the indefinite article "a" in the large type employed in this book to correct undoubted mistranslations, our author has undesignedly misrepresented the meaning of the original.

(4) In his note on chap. ii. 20, Dean Payne Smith refers to the Masoretic correction, which substitutes a word meaning "I will not *transgress*," in the place of the word which is found in the text, and which means, "I will not serve." Our author refers very properly to the rendering of the verse by the LXX. and Vulgate, and also by many modern commentators, in accordance with which, by the adoption of the second person instead of the first in the preceding part of the verse (viz., "*Thou* hast broken," "*Thou* hast said"), an entirely consistent sense is given to the text as it stands: "I will not *serve*." He then proceeds to observe that if the Masorites had known of so simple a rendering, "they would not have had recourse to so strong a measure as to change the reading." This remark appears to us to assume, on very insufficient grounds, that the Masorites corrected the written text in the margin, not in accordance with any actual variation of readings, but simply in accordance with their own conception of what the original reading was. A charge of this nature is surely of too serious a character to be preferred against the Masorites, unless supported by conclusive evidence.

Digitized by Google

(5) Dean Payne Smith, in his note on chap. iii. 16, proposes, in place of the words, "Neither shall that be done any more," to read, "Neither shall it (*i.e.*, the ark) be made any more." We are disposed to agree with the Dean as to this rendering, which does not lack authority, but we think that in a critical Commentary it would have been desirable to state that the proposed translation involves a change of punctuation.

(6) Dean Payne Smith considers the Authorized Version of chap. iv. 2, "And thou shalt swear, the Lord liveth, in truth," etc., as "unintelligible," and observes justly, that the phrase, "*The Lord liveth*," is the regular form of the Jewish oath. He proposes to render the words, "But wouldst swear truly .... by the living Jehovah." Now, whilst entirely agreeing with our author in regarding the words in question as the ordinary Jewish form of oath, we think that the rendering which he proposes is not so literal as that of the Authorized Version, whilst the meaning appears to us to be the same: viz., that the form of oath, "The Lord liveth," or "As the Lord liveth," is to be used as an expression of the acknowledgment of the true God on the part of the people, and to be used by them, not deceptively, but with just and honest intent.

Lastly, the reading which is found in many *codices* and editions in chap. v. 7, "I fed them to the full," instead of "I caused them to swear" (involving the change of one point only in the Hebrew word, thus differently rendered), is not, we believe, as Dean Payne Smith represents it, an instance of *K'ri* and *K'thib*, but simply a various reading; and, as far as we have observed, the reading which our author describes as the *K'ri*, occurs as commonly as the other reading in the text of the Hebrew Bibles in common use.

We have pointed out a few specimens of the minor blemishes which we think we have detected in this Commentary, in the hope that this, as well as the preceding volumes, will undergo the careful revision of the learned and accomplished contributors; and that ultimately the work will become worthy of a permanent place amongst the best and choicest productions of the clerical members of the English Church.

We will only add, that we should like to have seen a more frequent reference to, and a fuller recognition of the great value of Keil's admirable Commentary on the Prophecies of Jeremiah, a translation of which, from the pen of Mr. David Patrick, has recently appeared in the Foreign Theological Library of the Messrs. Clarke, of Edinburgh, and which is well worthy of a place on the shelves of every theological student.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW REFORMATION.

The New Reformation. By Theodorus. London: Longmans. 1875.

THIS is a narrative of the Old Catholic movement from 1870 to the present time, with a historical introduction. The subject of which it treats is one of considerable importance. It may be pregnant with lasting consequences to the religious future of Germany, and we would not undervalue it because of its present confessedly small dimensions. In an intellectual country like that from which it proceeds, there may be almost a necessity that scholars appealing to learning and intellect should be the leaders in a movement of this description; and yet it is impossible to forget that these men are the countrymen of Luther, who, not without claims to learning, yet made his appeals direct to the hearts and consciences of all around. If the Reformation had been left in the hands of professors and learned men, we doubt whether it would ever have become an accomplished fact, instinct with spiritual life, and vindicating freedom for a noble people. Perhaps at length, in the providence of God, there may yet arise another Luther who shall take this fresh movement out of the hands of the vacillating guides, who are slowly and timidly groping their way out of Rome, whatever they may say or think, and shall set more millions free.

It is not improbable that the leaders in this struggle are disappointed at not meeting with more sympathy from Englishmen; but if this is the case, surely the blame must rest with themselves. There could be no reason to anticipate that men who were in 1871 fumbling with the Council of Trent, and whose doctrinal standpoint was, as is declared in this volume, "a repudiation of the new dogmas and adherence to the Tridentine Canons," could enlist much sympathy from those who were no longer entangled in this yoke of bondage. If that were to be the standpoint of the new Reformation, plainly English Churchmen could not join in a movement which for them would be retrogressive. There might be some amongst us yearning for assimilation to Rome, who would be glad, if they could, to have Romanism without the Pope, or as much of it as the nation would bear; but this is not the feeling nor the intention of the people of England. To such persons the position of the Old Catholics would be singularly attractive, just in proportion as it would be repulsive to the mass of our countrymen. One of the most hopeful indications in this new Reformation is the rapid progress of the movement, which already seems to be carrying the promoters of it beyond the retrograde fancies of some of their English sympathizers.

Digitized by Google

We find, for instance, at page 263 of this volume, that when it was proposed in 1874 that the Tenth Article for the promotion of doctrinal unity should run thus,—"We reject the new Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary as being contrary to the tradition of the first thirteen centuries, according to which Christ alone was conceived without sin," Canon Liddon expressed his wish that it should be condemned as "a dogma of faith," but not as a "pious opinion." It is due to him to add that he professed to reject it in either form; but "in the interests of liberty" he made the suggestion! In this attempt at bolstering up a foolish superstition he was supported by another Englishman (to our shame be it spoken). Whether the remainder of his few supporters were also English is not stated. It must be very confusing to foreigners to see Englishmen of some reputation in their Church thus patronizing the last and most extravagant novelties of Romish fetichism, out of which they themselves are struggling to escape. Canon Liddon's amendment might have been more judiciously presented to the Curia. The meeting had the good sense to negative it by a large majority.

To our apprehension it has been a fatal and a strange mistake on the part of the Old Catholics to go about the world questing after what has never had an existence since the first ages of the Church, even if it had then,—namely, unity,[a]—before they had fairly come to an understanding among themselves as to what they believed and held to be true doctrine. It is possible to be valiant for the truth; it is hardly possible to be enthusiastic over a tissue of compromises, or a theological sliding scale. Possibly Dr. Dollinger and his associates may see a way out of the imbroglio in which they have involved themselves, for the German mind is something very different from the English; but it passes our comprehension. Surely it is a case in which our Lord's words have a most significant and apposite meaning,—not that there is here any question of hypocrisy,—"First cast out the mote out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye." By their own confession the Old Catholics in Germany have to rid themselves of a number of superstitious dogmas, against which their reason and their learning revolt; for this the countrymen of Luther are in every sense of the word competent. They can reform themselves: they can pull the beams out of their own eyes. It would seem to be most agreeable to common sense that they should begin by this, and when they are conscious

[a] The Bishop of Lincoln has remarked that "Erasmus sacrificed truth to a love of unity." We wish Dr. Dollinger were fully alive to this.

Digitized by Google

that they are purged from that which they know themselves to be error, they should invite other Christians to unite with them. The necessity which led them to Utrecht for a Bishop is intelligible, and was indispensable after the craven tergiversation of their own Episcopate in miserable subserviency to the Curia of Rome. But there does not seem to be a similar necessity for convening stray people from all quarters professedly to accomplish by the resolutions of a coterie that which, if it were practicable, could only be the solemn act of Christendom. The proceeding betrays a consciousness of weakness which will hardly be removed by the accession of a few foreigners, not eminent, with rare exceptions, for rank or learning, and with one or two exceptions, such as the Dean of Chester and Canon Conway, for the most part strong partizans of ultra-sentiments; all certainly without a shadow of authority to speak in the name or on behalf of the Churches to which they may severally happen to belong. No well-informed person in Germany can, we suppose, imagine that the Church of England would in its corporate capacity recognise the Old Catholic body as a sister Church, until it had thoroughly repudiated the distinctive errors of Romanism; or that it would unite with Oriental Churches, disfigured with puerilities of which even Rome might be, and probably even now would be, ashamed. There may be fond fancies in the minds of quixotic individuals in England to which some credence may be given by those who are uninformed, and who know no more about the Oriential Churches than the mere fact that they are very ancient. But we are quite sure that if English Christians generally had any adequate conceptions of what the tenets, and still more the practices of Oriental Christians are, there would be no more disposition to amalgamate with them than with Rome. There does not of course exist the same hostile feeling for the Eastern Churches which there is against the Papacy, inasmuch as all those Churches are far distant, have never attempted to usurp any dominion over us, and have never wrought any cruelties in our midst. But it would hardly be possible for a rational Englishman, if he were not an ecclesiastical antiquarian, to conceal his contempt for the extravagant absurdities, the Ritualism run mad, which forms the staple of Oriental worship. Possibly there may yet be ecclesiastical reforms in Russia which will eventually affect what are often termed the Byzantine Churches, but they are still in a future which at present seems somewhat remote.

For our own part, we have no confidence in any attempt at external unity, which has not for its preliminary the abandonment of error plainly contradicted by the Word of God. Nay, we will go further, and say that until there is this abandonment

Digitized by Google

of error, we do not think this unity desirable. If the whole of Christendom could tomorrow be reduced to the Roman or Greek obedience, it is our distinct conviction that it would be a serious detriment to true religion. Probably even the Old Catholics would themselves shrink from it, and would conceive that at such a price unity would be too dearly purchased. Deeply as the existing antagonism between Churches is to be deplored, and manifestly inconsistent as it is with the ideal, which ought to be the real, of Christianity, it has at least this merit,—that it provokes to inquiry, and leads to watchfulness; in manifold instances it witnesses against evil, which without direct and immediate Divine interposition, would utterly consume the last remaining vestiges of genuine Christianity.

We have gone great lengths in England lately, but are hardly prepared to hold that the invocation of saints is "a duty necessary to salvation for every Christian," notwithstanding the Acts of the seventh Œcumenical Council. Oriental Christians hold that it is necessary to salvation. Do Old Catholics expect that English Christians will unite with those who uphold this heresy, —even with Dr. Dollinger himself, until he repudiates it, however highly they may otherwise esteem and sympathize with him?

Again, what would be the condition of the Church of Rome now, if it were not in so many lands brought face to face with Protestantism, and were not hence compelled to veil its most hideous deformities studiously, even from the contemplation of its own adherents? Who could attempt to fathom the depths of superstition in which Europe would without Protestantism have been sunk? What would have been the value of that unity which would have been unity in false doctrine, and combined perversion of the truth? This unity is the dream of Ultramontanes now, and the object of their most unscrupulous machinations. Would Dr. Dollinger and his adherents rejoice in its accomplishment? Most assuredly they would not. It is our firm belief that as honest and intelligent men, they would reject it with disdain; and yet two or three years ago they would have striven to bring about unity, while still adhering to the Tridentine canons! True, they seem since to have become somewhat wiser themselves; but what is the Greek Church prepared to abandon of its superstitions? Plainly there is much here which must precede unity: there must be abandonment of error, and adhesion to the truth as a rallying-point. We can and do rejoice at what has been attempted in this direction, but it should have been the result of more vigorous and independent effort. A reformed German Church, purified from Romish superstition, wholly and not partially, with a free Bible and a

Digitized by Google

Gospel ministry, might yet do more glorious things for the nation than even Bismark and Moltke have wrought out. There may be in the Old Catholic movement the seeds of this reform, but they have as yet borne little fruit; consequently little sympathy has been aroused for it beyond the limits of a clique.

It is in no spirit of unkindness we write this; on the contrary, nothing would cause greater delight to Christian folk in England, than to find that this New Reformation will not prove a *coup manqué*. It has however very little similarity to the former one. That may, in the impetuosity of its zeal, have flung away sundry things from the antipathy to Rome then prevailing, which might have been very precious, such as the Episcopate; but whether right or wrong, in all its proceedings it had this conspicuous merit,—that so far as it understood it, it preferred truth to unity; and its influence, despite all reverses, has been undying even to the present hour. We will not go the length of saying that we would rather go wrong with Luther than right with Dollinger, for that would be extravagant. But so far as is yet apparent, there would be more probability of being right with the Saxon peasant, even with the inclusion of his errors, than with the Bavarian Professor, until he has abandoned his.

As for the book which has elicited these remarks, we can very heartily commend it to any who wish for information on this interesting question. It is well written, and gives a very lucid account of the New Reformation up to the present time. The introduction, prefixed to it will be convenient to ordinary readers as a *resume* of Church history in brief compass. There is also a succinct account of the struggles which took place in the recent Vatican Council, quite sufficient to refresh the memories of those who were probably interested in it at the time, but who may since have lost sight of what then took place. It has an intrinsic value beyond its connection with the subject, as a convincing proof of how hopeless any attempt would be to promote reformation within the pale of the Church of Rome; "*Delenda est*" if the consciences of her votaries are to be enfranchised and truth is to prevail. The whole volume is highly encomiastic of the proceedings of the Old Catholics; but the story is so frankly told that the reader will be able to exercise his own judgment. Many will probably fail to find grounds for believing in the glorious vision which floats somewhat hazily before the gaze of Canon Liddon; but sympathy in many who peruse the book will be aroused for those who are groping their way so painfully, and yet so conscientiously, out of the thick darkness in which they have so long been enveloped; nor will true Christian men despise them, or despair of them, because it is only too apparent that as yet it is but a day of small things

Digitized by Google

with these, the latest Protestants, against the errors and superstitions of what Mr. Gladstone terms Vaticanism. When they become hearty Protestants against that system of development of error which our forefathers rejected, and of which Vaticanism is the legitimate and necessary result, it will be time to hold out to them the right hand of fellowship; meanwhile prayer that they may be guided out of error into the light and liberty and life of the Gospel of the grace of God is assuredly an appropriate Christian duty. (1 Cor. xii. 26.)

MR. R. PEARSALL SMITH.—PART II.

(HIS EXPERIENCE.)

Holiness through Faith. By R. Pearsall Smith. Revised Edition. London: Morgan and Scott.

THE POWER through which he that is in Christ occupies his position,—that is, realizes its two singular and characteristic features, and thus secures exemption from an evil conscience, and emancipation from the domination of the sin that is within him, and consequently a capacity to serve the living God,—is just as singular and as specific as these features themselves. It comprises two departments, the one of which is the *Priestly potency of Christ*, and the other the *energizing power of the Holy Ghost.*

(1) *The sacrifice and intercession of Christ* constitute a potency which is indispensable to the establishment and maintenance of a state of exemption from the jurisdiction of the Law, and to the realization of a conscience cleansed from the defilement of guilt, and to its contemporaneous invigoration.

The moral law in principle enters into the essence of God; and in His government it cannot be ignored, it cannot suffer disparagement, it cannot be inert. Man, a moral agent, cannot initiate a state of exemption from its jurisdiction, but through his identification with Christ dead. If after such initiation he commit sin, he cannot maintain this exemption but through the active intervention of the death of Christ. It is through the intercession of Christ before God, as the abiding and ever-acting and efficacious High Priest of our profession, that this intervention is effected and upheld. Here the testimony of St. John is express and explicit: "If any man (Christian) sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, and He is the propitiation for our sins." (1 John ii. 2.) Such is the specific action and effect before God of this advocacy, that all for whom it intervenes,—that is, all united to Christ by faith, and so given to Him by the Father (John xvii.

Digitized by Google

9, 20),—are upheld in their exemption from the jurisdiction of the Law, and therefore protected against its condemnation. Hence, be the sin of such what it may, it does not in action operate practically as a violation of Law. It operates simply as a violation of the domestic rule of God's family, which the offender is to recognise by repentance and confession, when the *godly sorrow* (Ps. li. 17) must be such as to imply and involve a maintenance, on his part, of the crucifixion of the old man to which he was devoted at baptism. In that case, the reaction of God with regard to his sin, which in itself is real, and in the conscience of the offender is realized through faith, is His Fatherly displeasure, which evaporates at the repentance of the culprit, since the offence is regarded by God and by himself simply as that of a child, which is forgiven freely, absolutely, and for ever (1 John i. 9), on a frank confession.

But the power of the sacrifice of Christ is not confined to its efficacy with God. It is efficacious also in the spirit of the offender.

We have to assert that guilt is the specific defilement of the spirit of a moral agent. The proper effect of moral defilement is to disqualify, to disable, to disorder, and to discourage, in short. Now, by the effectual application of the blood of Christ to the conscience of the offender through the medium of faith, the non-imputation of guilt is realized. Personal freedom from its condemnation, therefore, is also realized; and then through the conjoint action of the spirit of truth in Christ Jesus, the specific effects of the defilement of the conscience in the human spirit are neutralized. The consciousness of God's peace and love, the realization of His fellowship, and of liberty in His presence, all of which had become weak and tremulous, ineffective and uncertain, so that the possession and enjoyment of the special capacities by which the Christian is qualified to serve the living God with a real, that is an inward, free, joyful, and single-hearted service, began to suffer, are all restored,—nay, often are more than restored; for by the special favour resting on those who in Christ appear as His members, and are accepted in Him with an exuberant grace (Eph. i. 6), often an invigoration greater in degree than the pre-existing strength may be the issue. We have another of the singular characteristics of "the state of grace" into which the Christian has access by faith, in the fact that there may be not a stoppage of growth when sin emerges, but actually an eventual promotion, if the sin be instantly succeeded by repentance and faith, and by a thorough realization of the application of the blood of Christ to the conscience. This may be comprised in what St. John refers to in these words: "If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins,

Digitized by Google

and to *cleanse* us from all *unrighteousness*." (1 John i. 9; 2 Cor. vii. 8—11.)

Then is there a fulfilment of what was typified under the Law by the application of the "water of separation." The body of the Israelite was defiled by the touch of death,—for death embodies sin,—and thus disqualified to enter the camp, to draw near to God, and to worship Him. This defilement vanished, with its disabling consequences, when the ashes of the red heifer mingled with water were sprinkled on him. An evil conscience is equally potent to disqualify the spirit of man for the realization of God's presence, and for the spiritual performance of His service. When the heart is cleansed from an evil conscience by the co-operative application of the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice and of the Spirit of Truth, the spirit of the Christian is cleansed from defilement. He realizes the restoration of fellowship with God, and the renewal and invigoration of his powers to serve Him in spirit and in truth. (Heb. ix.13, 14; x. 22.)

It follows that when the cleansing of the blood of Christ is applied, and properly efficacious in the believer himself, he does more than realize his exemption from the jurisdiction of the Law and its effects. He realizes, contemporaneously, an effect which is not only pacifying and reassuring, not only morally sanative, but altogether morally invigorating.

But in order that the Sacrifice and intercession of Christ may thus operate in the consciousness, we must understand the function which they discharge, and by faith realize its effectual action with regard to ourselves. In this respect Mr. R. P. Smith confesses that he was deficient. He had partaken, indeed, of the benefit of Christ's death and intercession at his conversion; and of the consequent reconciliation with God he entertained a lively recollection; but he had failed to make himself acquainted with them as living organs in Christ's *abiding* administration of salvation, in constant action for the practical, permanent, and conscious enjoyment of reconciliation. Therefore he did not fall back on faith, and entrench himself behind the mediation of the death and intercession of Christ before God, when sin revived and withstood him. Hence, when in the ensuing conflict conscience was wounded and exclaimed, the wound was not healed: it remained open,—it mortified; and all the pernicious and tormenting effects of an evil conscience in the mixed and critical condition of the Christian consciousness,—in exasperating the corruption of the old man, and stifling the vigour and the courage of the new man,—emerged; and his deplorable experience was the issue.

(2) The *energizing power of the Holy Ghost* which imparts the vitality requisite to the realization and enjoyment of the two

Digitized by Google

features of our position,—death and resurrection with Christ, and their respective and conjoint effects,—is also, not only special, but singular. This singularity we encounter in the fact, that in the mode of its outgoing and operation that power is *miraculous*. If we accept the ministration of it as a fact, and realize its application to ourselves, we believe that God, as a person, through Jesus as His organ, and the Holy Ghost as His efficacy, exerts His personal power, His creative energy, from the personal interest which He has in us,—exerts it in ourselves as individuals,—and effects what, through His administration of the fixed and regular powers of nature, could not and would not be achieved. This is faith in a sort of absolute sense; it is not the faith which owes its instruction and enterprise to the culture of nature: it is the *δεῦτε* of Revelation; and the Spirit of God is the source of its origin and strength. For its production certain special conditions are requisite. We must be convinced that it is the express purpose of God to exert such power, and that it is *righteous* for Him to do so. In the present instance, the latter condition requires to be emphasized. To this necessity we are indebted, no doubt, for the remarkable statement introduced by St. Paul in the first four verses of the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. To appreciate it, we must recall such considerations as these.

By the first Adam sin entered, and it so revolutionized the nature of man that his capacity to serve his Creator as he ought was extinguished. Mortality possessed the body, the body invaded the spirit, and man in his spirit became *carnal*. For a man to be thus in his spirit, is to be in a state which for his spirit is death, being in a state of discord and inability with regard to God. St. Paul asserts, "To be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be, so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Rom. viii. 6, 7, 8.) Now at this fatal perversion of His creature God was righteously displeased. Whether the ineffable perfection of His moral instincts and administration left Him at liberty to annihilate moral beings, and thus to exterminate their responsibility in their extinguishment, we know not. Moved by love, the essence of His being, He determined to rectify the calamity of man, by restoring to him the capacity of serving His Maker, as He by a spirit only can be served, that is, "in spirit and in truth," through the direct application of His power, and thus to rescue him from the bondage of sin and death. But what was that bondage specifically, and how came it to befall the creature of God? It was "sin that dwelleth in me," said the apostle (Rom. vii. 17). It was that "I

Digitized by Google

am carnal, sold under sin" (14 v.) It was strictly "captivity to the law of sin which is in my members" (23 v.) For this calamity man was indebted to himself. The freedom of self-disposal bestowed on him by his Creator, he had abused. In the very presence of God's prediction of the consequences, amidst the special light which it emitted, he had disregarded the direction, and broken the commandment of God. The bondage in question was the issue; and the doubt presents itself: Is it righteous on the part of the Creator,—the upholder and avenger of the moral principle, the Director and Ruler of moral existence,—to deliver the culprit from the consequences of a voluntary offence, by rescuing him from the bondage in question, superinduced by his own transgression; and that by a direct and independent exertion of His creative power? This doubt exists in a state of solution in the consciousness of all men, for all are moral beings, though the clever, audacious, and enterprising sceptic, or those who are timid from the very dread lest in thought they should dishonour God, be the only parties who venture by reflection to precipitate the doubt, and present it distinctly and definitely. From the atmosphere, however, of the consciousness of him who has to live by faith in the ministration on his behalf, of the power of God to enable him to realize and enjoy his position in Christ, all doubt with regard to the righteousness of such a ministration on God's part must be expelled; and it is expelled by the passage referred to. Through the intervention of what the man Christ Jesus did and suffered with regard to, and in connection with, sin, it is there practically asserted to be a righteous thing for God to break the dominion which sin holds in the nature of man, and to emancipate those who, by faith, are one with Christ. These are the words:—

"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, *condemned* sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. viii. 2—4.)

The dominion of sin in the flesh then has come into judgment before God. He hath condemned its existence as an objective enormity under His government, and passed on it the sentence of suppression and extirpation. This judgment is involved in the work of Christ. Upon it the sentence stands, as on a righteous foundation; and consequently when God puts forth the Divine power to carry it into execution, by the deliverance of those who are in Christ from the dominion of sin in the flesh, His achievement is like Himself,—*righteous.*

Digitized by Google

Such is the sanction which justifies, in the deepest, most sensitive, and most enlightened conscience, the faith of one who, in Christ, is bold to believe that God will exert His personal direct and creative energy, in order to qualify and enable him to realize death with Christ and resurrection with Him, with their respective consequences.

This energizing power is exercised by God, and is *effectual*. We have its product in the new life which is imparted when we are raised together with Christ. It is in that life and its creative and developing effects, and in its appropriate instincts and affections, that St. Paul finds the efficiency of Christ's salvation, as expressed in the transformation and growth of its subjects. He does not hesitate to say, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creature*." (Gal. vi. 15.)

The movements of the new vitality are of God, by His Spirit, and through His Son. Potency, therefore, is their characteristic, and consequently a revolution is effected in the psychology of fallen man. The person is no longer "in the flesh," but "in the spirit." Whatever may be the import of these definitions of condition, the chains of his captivity to the law of sin and death are broken. They could not resist the impulsive, uplifting, renewing, and emancipating power of the vital forces of the "new creation," moving according to the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." He, therefore, in person is so far free that he is consciously the master of himself, in a moral sense. "Renewed in the spirit of the Word," he has acquired a mind which is "spiritual." This he adopts as his own, and in the light of it detects the falseness and baseness of the "carnal mind," resisting its instincts, and rejecting its suggestions and imaginations. New lusts, also, or desires, are engendered in him,—those of the Spirit,—and he appropriates them, and devotes himself to their pursuits; wherefore he repudiates the affections and lusts of the flesh, as alien to his proper being, and the usurping progeny of moral and spiritual distemper, and he determines "not to fulfil them," and is successful in his purpose. His then is the specific enfranchisement of a moral agent expressing itself in this sense, that he can and does refuse to "mind the things of the flesh," and can and does "mind the things of the Spirit," the Spirit of holiness and truth," and this through the emergence and diffusion of a new affection, even of the love of God, "shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost." In truth he is in his spirit restored, God's "workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (Eph. ii. 10), the nucleus of "the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. iv. 24.) Wherefore the design of God is effected in principle, for the law

Digitized by Google

of God is not only discovered to be spiritual, but as such it is chosen in love, and obeyed from the heart. (Rom. vii. 17.) No longer, therefore, is the person so carnal as to be "sold under sin" (vii. 14), but, on the contrary, he is so rescued from its bondage as to be able to serve his Maker as he ought,—viz., in spirit and in truth. What is more, his deliverance from the darkness and paralysis of the carnal mind is such that it is within the range of his capacity to "*set his affections* on things above, and not on things on the earth;" and, as one risen with Christ, to "*seek* those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God." (Col. ii. 1, 2.)

Yet his position is critical. He must maintain in himself the crucifixion of the old man, which is that of the flesh, with its affections and lusts; for if not, his heart will condemn him, and he will lose his confidence in God. (1 John iii. 20, 21.) Consequently he will cease to realize the consciousness of the effect before God on his behalf, of the sacrifice and intercession of Christ. His personal exemption from the condemnation of the law will become a matter of doubt and hesitation in his mind, for practically it is not so long as we are led by the Spirit to refuse the fulfilment of the lusts of the flesh, but in the pursuit of the contrary, which is specifically its crucifixion, that we can realize that we are "not under the law." (Gal. v. 18.) Should a sense of its condemnation repossess us, the old atmosphere of our consciousness reappears, namely, that which is congenial to the flesh, and revives and encourages it, while it stifles the "new man," and reduces at once his vigour and confidence, weakening his power and his purpose to recoil, and imperilling his supremacy. Good reason, therefore, had the Apostle for the evolution of the doctrine taught in Rom. vii. 4—6, and for his assertion of the practical principle grounded on it in ch. vi. 11—14. And who is sufficient to live as he has proscribed? They only who bear in mind the assertion, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God, who is our life," etc. (Col. iii. 3, 4.) Were we proficient in the doctrine and training of the Apostle, our experience would be like his,—a simple, transparent, and masculine sample of the genuine offspring of "the power of God unto salvation," ministered through the Gospel. Inwardly "we should worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh;" and outwardly we should be ever "putting on the Lord Jesus, and making no provision for the flesh." And, therefore, we should be in our consciousness the very opposite to Mr. R. P. Smith, during the first days of his career.

The METHOD of realizing and consciously using the power of God, administered through Christ by His Spirit, is by *faith*. St.

Digitized by Google

Paul asserts, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I live in the flesh I *live by the faith* of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." (Gal. ii. 20.)

Grace is either the favour of God or the fruits of that favour, or both. The communication therefore of Divine life, or power, or influence, is grace. Taking it in this sense, many seem to conceive of it as the merchant does of his cash balance at the banker's, that is, as a deposit handed over to us, which, once bestowed, may be drawn upon. In this case, there is no essential difference between the mode in which we use it, and the mode in which we make use of natural gifts. The latter such as the powers to understand, to love and hate, to resolve and will, to act and execute, are also the gifts of God: we however regard them as our own. We therefore feel that they are limited,—sufficient for this or that, and for no more,—and we turn away from this achievement or that, on the ground of the insufficiency of our capacity. It is precisely thus with those who take the above view of grace. They think that it is limited, and therefore inadequate to enable them to do or to suffer much that emerges in the pathway of duty or of endurance; wherefore in despondency they decline this enterprise, or that self-sacrifice in the service of Christ. Such is not all. They look to the gift of grace, which they assume themselves to have received, and not to the Giver; and rely on it, and on their personal use of it, for success and progress. What essential difference is there then between the service of him who relies on his use of a limited spiritual gift of God, and the service of him who relies on his use of God's natural gifts? The consciousness of both may be essentially that of one who is under the Law; for both, when they satisfy themselves in their respective achievements, may with the Pharisee thank God that they are what they are, and yet credit themselves as he did,—that is, with a good use of the gifts of God. Hence, in those who hold this view of grace practically, a legal spirit with its consequences is almost certain to be developed. The proud may glory in themselves for the use they make of the grace of God, and become self-righteous. Have we no specimens of such in Rome's calendar of saints? The humble (unable to discover in themselves the consciousness of any goodness, or of any strength and sufficiency,—for grace, whatever conception we have of it, is palpable, not through itself, but through its effects) may distrust themselves in all respects, and fall into a state of despondency. Such was the fate of Mr. R. P. Smith.

St. Paul's conception of grace, contemplated as the life, the power, or the influence imparted by God, was essentially different.

Digitized by Google

He never permitted himself to separate it from the personal action of Christ through His Spirit. It was the activity of Christ dwelling in him that sustained in him the new life in all and every of its movements and its effects. If through its energy he achieved aught, he did not trace the achievement simply to his personal exercise of a Divine gift, but chiefly to the personal action of Christ in him. He said, "I can do all things through Jesus Christ, which strengtheneth me." (Phil. iv. 13.) When afterwards he referred to the agency, he said it was "not I, but the grace of God which was with me." (1 Cor. xv. 10.) What he did appropriate and designate his own was weakness. The strength and sufficiency that wrought in him effectually he did not simply appropriate: he traced it to Christ present, administering it through His Spirit as it was required. Wherefore his language was not self-contradictory when he said, "When I am weak then am I strong." Christ Himself he introduces in the very attitude and position of giving, as the gift is needed, saying, in reply to his request for the removal of a special weakness, "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness." "Most gladly therefore," responds the Apostle, "will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." (2 Cor. xii. 9, 10.) That this power was not realized by him as a gift limited in extent, and in his absolute possession like a gift of nature, but as the presence of Christ, ready the instant he needed succour, to minister it, he implies by his assertion, "The Lord stood by me, and strengthened me." (2 Tim. iv. 17.) Christ therefore, by His Spirit, operating in us as His members in the discharge of His function as our Head, is St. Paul's conception of grace, contemplated as the fruit of favour. Wherefore Christ Himself is the Seat of our spiritual vitality, and the Fountain of every issue of power or influence that expresses itself in us, in our will or in our deeds, in the service of God, and in the working out of our salvation.

And how are we to utilize this grace, to seek to obtain and to exercise it, in the occupation of our position in Christ? By faith. The Apostle says, "I live by the faith of the Son of God:" we must believe in the fact that Christ is present in us,—present to exert the energies of the new vitality,—present to exert in us strength and sufficiency for the performance and endurance of His will. That He may perform this His function as our Head, it is our part to pray, and then to go, and do, and suffer what becomes us and our position, in the unhesitating and unbroken confidence that through Him we shall prove sufficient. Here the guarantee of our Lord is infallible: "Ask, and ye shall receive." "Whatsoever ye ask, believing, ye shall receive." (Matt. xxi. 22.)

Obviously such exercise of faith admits of degrees. The babe

Digitized by Google

in Christ is awkward, unsteady, and uncertain: the young man in Christ is more practised: the father is expert and settled in it as a habit. Of this progress St. Paul gives some hint when he said, "I have *learned* in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content..... I can do all things through Jesus Christ, which strengtheneth me." Expertness in this exercise was evidently in his purpose, when he undertook the career defined in these words: "That I may know Christ and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death, if by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead." And doubtless he had become skilful in living by the faith of the Son of God when he said, "I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark." (Phil. iii. 12—15.)

Mr. R. P. Smith informs us that it was not thus, by the faith of the Son of God, that he lived. At his failure then in the effort to achieve the specific experience of the Christian we are not surprised. For thus to live is the only mode that harmonizes with the condition of him who is so at one with Christ as to be dead, and risen with Him, and now in that organic connection which is figured by the specific union and vital adjustment and action of the members with the head in the human body. It is by ever relying on Christ, and realizing through faith His personal, sustaining, and enabling succour through His Spirit, that we assume the very attitude to which the economy of that dispensation of the Divine power by which we are to occupy our position in perfection and realize the consciousness of growing up into Christ, is adapted. Then it is that we intelligently realize the promise of Christ: "Because I live, ye shall live also" (John xiv. 19); and the affirmations of St. Paul: "Christ is all and in all" (Col. iii. 11); and "ye are complete in Him" (Col. ii. 10). Beyond all question, when once we are so constant and expert in the exercise of faith in Christ's presence and inworking that we realize what the apostle meant when he asserted, "Not I, but Christ liveth in me," the realization of our union with Him is consummated for practical purposes. Whatever the salvation may be of which Jesus is the centre and the source, is either in our possession or in the process of acquisition. We may appropriate the assurance of St. Paul: "Of Him are ye in Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." (1 Cor. i. 30.) But what does a practical and permanent faith in the personal support and inworking of Christ imply? Nothing less or other than a

Digitized by Google

total surrender of ourselves, that He may, through His spirit and word, work in us as willing subjects. This requisite surrender takes its form from the position we occupy. It is precisely what is symbolised at baptism,—the crucifixion of the old man for the express purpose of the destruction of the body of sin, and the surrender of the person to be "led by the Spirit," that we may not only "live in the Spirit," but "walk in the Spirit," and bring forth His appropriate fruits. It follows that in the acquirement of the habit of "living by the faith of the Son of God," we consummate our occupation of the Christian position.

These remarks may suffice to indicate a part of the knowledge which is requisite in order that one who is born again of the Spirit through faith in Christ, and then animated by the instincts and affections of His vitality, may so conduct himself as to reach the specific—the normal—experience of a Christian.

(To be Continued.)

THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF THE JEWS.—No. IX.

Concluding Observations.

A CAREFUL examination of Scripture has led us to the conclusion that the sacred writers do not contemplate or provide for any rites in the Christian dispensation exactly answering to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. The daily, Sabbatical, monthly, and yearly sacrifices, have been fulfilled in Christ, and their place is taken by those spiritual services of contrition, prayer, praise, and good works, which God looked for even in the case of the Jews. At the same time, as it is evident that there is a relationship between the Lord's Supper and the paschal feast, it might be supposed that any particular Church, starting from the basis thus afforded in Scripture, might build up a system of rites analogous in some respects to those of the Old Testament. It may be judged, however, especially from the Epistles to the Galatians and Colossians, that such a course would be attended with considerable danger, as the multiplication of rites and observances tends to do away with the simplicity which is in Christ. The Churches were to steer a middle course between ceremonialism on the one hand, and mysticism or quietism on the other; but false teachers soon sprang up, and worshippers were driven to various extremes. Judaism and heathenism, each with their attendant ritual terminology, infected the teaching and services of the early disciples, and the Church of Christ has never been free from the consequences. At the present moment,

Digitized by Google

our own Church is disturbed by ardent believers in the doctrine that the Communion Table is an altar, that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice, that the presbyter is a *sacerdos*, and that the holy feast should be accompanied with incense, vestments, lights, prostrations, and everything which could confirm these ideas.

It is proposed in this concluding paper to touch upon some of the leading points of the Eucharistic controversy, in the light of the truths already affirmed. And first, it may be observed as certainly remarkable, that the two leading rites or sacraments of the Church of Christ are based on pre-Sinaitic ordinances. Circumcision was not of Moses, but of the patriarchs; and the paschal feast was appointed before the Levitical priesthood was set apart. At the same time, it must be allowed that we have the decisive authority of St. Paul for tracing a certain analogy between the Jewish sacrifices and the Lord's Supper, and it is important to examine accurately wherein that analogy consists.

In the tenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle cites the case of Israel's fall, in spite of all the ordinances and privileges bestowed on the nation by God, as an ensample for the Christian Churches, so that he who thinketh he standeth, may take heed lest he fall. "Wherefore," he proceeds, "flee from idolatry." The enormity of this sin he thus sets forth: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not joint participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not joint participation in the body of Christ? For we, the many, are one bread, one body, seeing that the whole number of us partake of the one bread." This passage clearly refers to the Lord's Supper as the bond of union between all Christians, who in feeding on the bread and wine with their mouths, feed also with their hearts on the body and blood of Christ. But the Apostle continues: "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not the eaters of the sacrifices participators of the altar?" That is to say, Are they not brought into communion with God, by sharing that food, part of which was burnt on the altar? Here we have the very centre of the sacrificial theory, and the juxtaposition of these two points in the Apostle's argument shows that in his estimation the sacred eating in the one case was analogous with the sacred eating in the other. From this passage, then, it may be fairly drawn that the Lord's Supper is a sacrificial feast; and this view is confirmed by the context, for St. Paul proceeds: "What do I say, then (*i.e.*, What do I mean)? that an idol is anything, or that what is sacrificed to an idol is anything (that is to say, that any essential change is produced in the food, either by the fact of its being sacrificed to idols, or through the influence and operation of those idols)? Nay, rather, I mean that what the heathen sacrifice they sacrifice

Digitized by Google

to demons, and not to God. (See Deut xxxii. 17; LXX.) Ye cannot (it is morally impossible that you can) be drinkers of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup of demons as well. Ye cannot partake of the Lord's Table, and of the table of demons." What can be clearer than that union with the object of worship by sacramental eating, is the one point in common between an idol feast and the Lord's Supper? The sequel of the chapter shows that to eat "with conscience of the idol," was to be a spiritual partaker of idolatry; whilst to eat flesh without knowing whether it might have been sacrificed to idols or not, would produce no spiritual effect, the influence of the food upon the spirit being subjective: *i.e.*, dependent on the mental and moral attitude of the worshipper.

In returning to the subject of the Lord's Supper in the eleventh chapter, St. Paul exposes the sin of partaking of the bread and wine for carnal purposes,—merely as so much food,—without reference to the spiritual object of the ordinance: "When *you* (mark the emphasis in the Greek) come together, it is not to eat *the Lord's* Supper, for each takes first *his own* supper in the eating: and whilst one hungers, another is drunken. Is it that ye have no houses to eat and drink in? or do ye despise God's Church (or congregation), and put to shame those who have no means of their own?" Then, after reciting the ordinance, he adds: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye *tell forth* the Lord's death until He come." Having thus set forth the spirit and purpose of the ordinance, he adds that to eat and drink with unworthy motives is to be guilty, and consequently to be in danger of punishment, through want of due respect to the body and blood of the Lord. It is to eat and drink one's own condemnation, through want of discerning[a] the Lord's body, which the bread represents. But let a man scrutinize his motives, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For if we spiritually discerned ourselves, we should not be judged; but various infirmities, nay, even death, was inflicted as a punishment by the Lord on those Christians who were guilty in this matter, so that they might not be condemned with the world.

The two passages we have been considering show that the consecrated elements are to be regarded as in a certain sense analogous with the flesh and blood of the victims offered under the Old Testament; but we must be careful not to press the analogy further than the inspired writers permit, or otherwise we should be coming in direct conflict with other parts of

[a] The discernment here spoken of is moral or spiritual. The same word is used two verses further for the spiritual discernment of one's own motives.

Digitized by Google

Scripture. Christ is the Priest: His work of sprinkling the atoning blood has been done once and for all, in God's sight; and He now ministers the bread of life to the believer, both in the Lord's Supper and in other ways, through the Holy Spirit. The presbyter presides at the sacred feast, not as a priest, but in a subsidiary position answering to that of the Levite, and as the duly appointed leader of the congregation, acting in Christ's behalf, as head of the household. Under the Old Dispensation, the Israelites eat with their mouths the actual body which had been offered, the blood of which had been sprinkled on the altar. We eat with our mouths the bread which represents Christ's body offered, and we drink the wine which represents his blood shed, and in so doing we are brought into fellowship with Him.

Thus whilst the Lord's Supper is a sacrificial feast it does not call for the functions of an earthly *sacerdos*. The minister acts for the Lord, not as a *sacerdos* in the sprinkling of the blood, but as a good steward dispensing that rite which is a means of giving spiritual food to the people. The necessity of caution in drawing inferences from the use of words and ideas which are manifestly connected with the sacrificial system of the Jews receives a remarkable illustration in the fact that sacrificial terms are used in the Old Testament. Even with respect to the destruction of the wicked, in Ps. xxxvii. 20; Is. xxxiv. 6; Ez. xxxix. 17—20; Zeph. i. 7, 8.

The "pure offering" spoken of in Malachi i. 11, is contrasted with the polluted offerings spoken of in the same chapter as rendered by the Levites and priests. The word "offering" is used seven times in the prophecy of Malachi, and in each case it stands for the *minchah*, which, however, cannot be restricted in these passages to the bloodless meat-offering, but must be taken in the general sense of "a present." If we were to take the *minchah* in a technical sense it is evident that it could not apply to the Lord's Supper, for no part of the *minchah* was eaten by the common people. It is evident therefore that the incense and unpolluted *minchah* to be offered to God by the heathen in every place must refer to the class of sacrifices described in Heb. xiii. 15, 16; Rev. v. 8: viz., prayer, praise, and good deeds.

In what sense is the Lord's Supper a *memorial?*

It has already been pointed out that there is no connection between the "memorial," or consumed portion of the *minchah*, and the Eucharistic feast. When our Lord told His disciples to keep the rite in remembrance of Him, He intended us to understand that the institution was to remind us of the night in which He was betrayed, and of His whole Mission, which culminated in His crucifixion.

Digitized by Google

St. Paul says, "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do *show forth* the Lord's death till He come." (1 Cor. xi. 26.) Is this a showing forth to one another, or to the world at large, or to God? Possibly all these ideas may be included, according to the analogy of the Old Testament. The rehearsal of God's wonderful works, whether by word or by rite, was commonly understood amongst the Jews to be pleasing to the Most High, as well as profitable to the people; and it has been affirmed that the Passover Liturgy is called the Haggadah, or showing forth, not only because the Israelites told their children, and set forth publicly in the feast the marvellous deliverance of their nation, but also because they recounted before God the story of their salvation. Whether this was the case or not, no one can examine the usage of the Greek word adopted in the text now before us without coming to the conclusion that a telling out before men rather than before God was uppermost in the Apostle's mind.

In what sense is the Lord's Supper an offering to God?

The whole service is one of praise and thanksgiving, and all praise ascends as a well-pleasing offering through the meditorial action of the one High Priest. The same may be said of the "alms and oblations" presented at the time, as a token that the worshipper's heart is touched by a sense of God's love. The same also may be said of that self-dedication with which the Communion Service closes. The bread and wine are sometimes regarded as an offering; but forasmuch as no part of them is consumed by fire, but the whole is eaten by the congregation, at whose expense they have been provided, there is nothing here which exactly answers to the Biblical idea of an offering. We have no reason to suppose that the bread and wine in the Passover supper were offered to God in any sense, although associated with the Paschal Lamb, which was an offering. It has been pointed out, moreover, in a previous paper, that there is not the remotest connection between the *minchah*, or meat-offering, and the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, for no part of the *minchah* might be eaten by the congregation.

In a petition presented to Convocation a short time ago, and signed by Canon Liddon, Dean Cowie, Mr. Medd, and others, it is stated that "the complete act of Eucharistic communion consists properly of participation both *in oblation* and in reception," and that consequently persons who do not wish to "receive" ought not to be debarred from the liberty of "occasional communion, *in oblation only*, as an act of worship." What sense are we to put on the word "oblation" here? An answer is suggested by Dr. Littledale, in a Catechism which appears at the end of the "Altar Manual," published by Messrs.

Digitized by Google

Palmer, and quoted by the Bishop of Ripon in the *Guardian*, in March, 1875. He writes thus:—

"*Q.* Why does he (the priest) stand in front of the altar?
"*A.* Because he is imitating our Lord Jesus Christ, Who stands as our High Priest before the throne of God the Father.
"*Q.* What should we do when the priest begins this prayer [the Prayer of Consecration]?
"*A.* We should pray to God that He may accept the sacrifice which the priest and we, through him, are about to offer.
"*Q.* What is this sacrifice?
"*A.* The true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.
"*Q.* Is this a fresh offering of Him?
"*A.* No, it is the continual presentation of His one oblation of Himself once offered, and is part of that same offering.

. . . . . .

"*Q.* What great mystery takes place in the act of consecration?
"*A.* When the priest has broken the bread, and blessed the cup, and repeated the words of our Lord Himself—'This is My Body' and 'This is My Blood,' the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are really and truly present on the altar under the forms of bread and wine.
"*Q.* What does the priest do then?
"*A.* He offers the sacrifice to God the Father."

Canon King in his "Communicant's Manual" writes to the same effect:—

"The consecration of the elements is the most solemn and the central act of the service, by which the bread and wine are made, through the power of God the Holy Ghost, verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, and are offered to God the Father as the Eucharistic sacrifice."

We gather that it is the opinion of these gentlemen, that the people and the presbyter present to God that which is on the Communion Table, and which appears under the forms of bread and wine, but which really is CHRIST. The persons who hold this view emphatically deny that this is a *repetition* of the offering made once for all, but they say it is a *continuation* of that offering,—an expression which appears to us to be sheer nonsense, for how can that be continued to be offered by the presbyters of our Church which is described in Scripture as having been offered *once for all?* We read of "continual" offerings, indeed, in the Old Testament, but these were presented year by year, at stated times, and they are brought into direct contrast with our Lord's offering in the New Testament.

Feeling the difficulty of holding a view so contrary to that taught in the Scriptures, others have suggested that in the Lord's Supper there is a *representation* of our Lord's sacrifice.

Digitized by Google

This statement is true, or not true, according to what is meant by it. The Lord's Supper certainly represents *to us* the glorious and solemn sacrifice once for all offered by Christ on the cross, and once for all presented by the High Priest in heaven itself. But very often something different is meant. This further meaning we must bring out by asking another question.

Does the Lord's Supper represent upon earth the continual or repeated presentation of Christ's sacrifice by Himself in heaven?

All questions touching on Divine actions are very mysterious, and far beyond the comprehension of the children of time. Our only safe plan is to follow the teaching of Scripture on such a point. Here we are told that having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, the Lord sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. (Compare Heb. i. 3, with x. 12.) Thus the Lord's propitiatory work is complete.

Is there, however, any passage which implies that the High Priest is specially engaged in presenting His propitiatory sacrifice whenever the Lord's Supper is being partaken of? Is it even theologically correct to say that He is actively engaged in presenting His sacrifice to God now at all? The teaching of Scripture is that He ever liveth to make intercession for us, and He is acting as our High Priest, or Mediator, with God. Through Him our praises, prayers, and good works ascend. Through Him God's grace descends. He is the Lamb in the midst of the throne, and His presence there may be regarded as a continuous presentation.

The Lord is described as "sitting down," because His sacrifice has been offered and also accepted once for all. He is described as "standing," because He is the minister of the new covenant actively engaged in superintending the course of the Church. The marks of His death remain; the efficacy of His death is always present.

Mr. M. F. Sadler, in an interesting letter in the *Guardian*, gives it as his opinion that the Lord's presentation of His sacrifice is one continuous act. "Not a number of separate acts frequently repeated, but one act of intercession, mediation, presentation, showing forth *or offering of Himself*, never intermitted, in virtue of which the present state of grace continues to exist." In this sense, he holds that Christ hath somewhat to offer. To reject this view, Mr. Sadler thinks, would involve the idea that our prayers, praises, and good works, would have to be presented by Christ "as independent offerings." We cannot, however, accept that idea, for it appears to run counter to the apostolic line of reasoning in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The writer of that Epistle draws a distinction between the ordinary offerings of four kinds which did not enter within the

Digitized by Google

veil, and the offering on the great day of atonement. The ordinary offerings were adapted to the Jewish dispensation, whilst that offered on the day of atonement pointed forward to the Christian Dispensation. He singles out various features connected with the services of that particular day which illustrated our Lord's work. (1) The blood was offered within the veil; (2) it was sprinkled on the mercy-seat, which thus took the place of the altar; (3) it was offered by the high priest alone, (4) and that only once a year; (5) the body of the victim was burnt up outside the camp. So, he argues, Christ our one High Priest has entered within the veil into the presence of the most High once for all, to present His own blood as an atonement for our sins, having suffered outside the city gate.

The practical lesson which is drawn in the thirteenth chapter is, that we should seek strength from *grace*, not from *meats;* from the work which the great day of atonement indicated, not from temporary Jewish offerings; from the altar or throne of grace which the mercy-seat typified,[b] not from Jewish altars; from the unseen High Priest through whom our sacrifices are all accepted, not from the Levitical priesthood. Judaism is not our abiding city: let us then bear the reproach of Christ as Moses did, being excommunicated if need be, whilst looking forward to the city which is heaven.

The late Mr. Wharton Marriott corresponded with Mr. Carter of Clewer on this subject some years ago, and their correspondence was afterwards printed. Mr. Carter's opinion was that Christ is ever offering Himself as a Victim before the Father; that the body once for all sacrificed, and the blood once for all shed, are *offered* (as well as "pleaded") before the Father by the earthly priest; and that this offering is parallel to, or consequent upon, Christ's offering of Himself in heaven. He puts forth what seems an extraordinary view, that the blood of Christ "is not now separate from Himself. It is in Him glorified, and is the life of His person, and cannot be offered except in His person, and as a part of His person." For these views Mr. Carter finds no warrant in Scripture. Mr. Marriott, in reply, carefully examined the texts bearing on the offering of Christ, and the terms applied to that offering. (See Heb. vii. 27; Eph. v. 1, 2; Heb. viii. 3; ix. 6, etc.; ix. 24, etc.; x. 1—18.) He is led to the conclusion, "that the offering of Himself made by our High Priest was once made, and once for all; therefore once only, because for perpetual efficacy; that He entered into the heavens not in order to His often offering of Himself; that He hath no need day by day to offer for sins, in that He did this once for

[b] See Rom. iii. 25, "to be (literally) a mercy-seat in, or by virtue of, His blood."

Digitized by Google

all by His offering of Himself." From this statement there is no escape.

What "Real Presence" is there in the Lord's Supper?

(*a*) There is "really present" to the *memory* the narrative of the Paschal feast, with all the solemn events that crowded in its train; and the person who forms the centre of them is present to the mind in the same sense as any other historical personage may be. We say *in the same sense*, but it ought to be *in a higher degree*, for the whole inner man, with all its faculties, including the memory and the imagination, ought to be more keenly alive and more keenly sensitive during the celebration of the Lord's Supper than at any other time. (*b*) There is "really present" to the faith the truth of that Word or Gospel which announces that the body of Christ was given for us, and the blood of Christ shed, that we might be partakers of remission and of all other benefits of His passion. These truths, or aspects of the one truth, are present in the same sense as any other truths in which we are personally interested, and which are brought vividly home to our minds, and thankfully meditated upon. Here, again, there is a difference in *degree*, because this truth is the foundation of all our hope for the future, as well as the main source of our spiritual life in the present. (*c*) The Holy Spirit is "really present" to our spirits, working upon us, though unseen and unfelt, applying the Word to our hearts, refreshing and strengthening our souls by its means, shedding God's love abroad within us, producing repentance, devotion to God and our Saviour, and love to our fellow-men. And where the Holy Spirit is, there the Father and the Son are also. The mode of this presence is utterly unintelligible to us; nevertheless it is *real and true*, but real and true in *the same sense* (though in a higher degree), during the faithful partaking of the Lord's Supper, as at other times in which we are living to Him, loving Him, and feeding upon His truth, under all which circumstances the Father and the Son come to us, and make their abode with us.

Thus we acknowledge the Real Presence of God in the faithful recipients, at the time of the Lord's Supper; but shall we go further, and accept such words as the following?—

> "O see, within a creature's hand,
> The world's Creator deigns to be
> Reposing, infant-like, as though
> On Joseph's arm or Mary's knee."[o]

Surely such teaching as this is utterly contrary to Scripture, and deserves stronger words of reprobation than we care to use, for it implies that God is in (or identified with) the bread and wine.

[o] See "Manual of Devotion," etc., edited by Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L., quoted by Mr. Curling, in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Digitized by Google

What is the effect of the Prayer of Consecration?

It is a prayer offered by the whole congregation, asking God that the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine might be made the means and occasion of the feeding on Christ's body and blood. Consecration does not change the chemical or material nature of the bread and wine, but sets them apart for a sacred use. The presbyter, acting as head of the household, recites the words of the institution, and puts his hand over the elements, in order to associate them with the bread and wine which the Lord had before Him at the original feast. At the same time he prays that the effects which the Saviour intended to follow from the rite, might be produced in the hearts and lives of the people there and then gathered together.

When we read that our Lord "blessed" and brake the bread, we are not to understand that He imparted any mysterious power to the substance of the bread, but that He blessed God, or gave thanks, and by so doing called down God's blessing on the partakers. This is clearly seen if we compare the exact words used in the four records of the institution; and so we read in 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5, that "every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with *thanksgiving*, for it is *consecrated* (ἁγιάζεται) by means of the Word of God and prayer." The blessing of the sacrificial feast by the Prophet Samuel, which we read of in 1 Sam. ix. 13, was no doubt of a similar character. St. Paul, when he spoke of "the cup of blessing which we bless" (1 Cor. x. 16), is supposed to have taken the expression from the name of one of the four cups of wine used by the Jews at the Passover.

What does a person receive who comes to the Lord's Supper *unworthily;* that is, in an unworthy spirit?

He receives the bread and wine, but disregards the fact that they are consecrated, or set apart for a sacred purpose, being made signs or sacraments of the body and blood of Christ. His memory is not affected, his heart is not touched, his moral feelings are not aroused, his conscience is not awakened, his love is not kindled by the word or truth that Christ died for his sins. God calls him by means of the rite, but he does not answer. The Lord draws near to him, giving him a gracious opportunity of communion, but he does not draw near to the Lord. He does not feed upon Christ, but reaps punishment to himself. His heart is hardened; and if he is altogether a hypocrite, partaking of the Lord's Supper from some mere worldly motive, he is treasuring up for himself wrath against the day of wrath.

What amount of ceremonial or symbolism ought to be added in order to give the Lord's Supper its full significance?

This question each particular Church must answer more or

Digitized by Google

less for itself. It is evident that the multiplication of costumes, ornaments, and postures, tends to divert the mind from the central truth contained within the rite, and to concentrate the attention on things which did not form part of the original institution. No symbolism should be introduced which would lead the congregation to suppose that the Lord's Supper is a propitiatory sacrifice, that the table is an altar, and that the celebrant is a mediating priest. The heart of the worshipper is to be directed simply to the fact that Christ crucified was the manifestation of God's love to sinners, and *as such*, the food of the soul.

Is the partaking of the Lord's Supper the sole means of feeding on Christ's body and blood?

Few would venture to answer this question in the affirmative. Even the late Archdeacon Freeman, whose statements in favour of sacerdotalism have already been examined, has acknowledged that the hearing of the Lessons is, from the Eucharistic point of view, a most free and real reception of Christ, closely akin to that which takes place in Holy Communion. ("Principles of Divine Service," vol. i., p. 348.) The difference is one of degree, but not of kind. When we meditate humbly and thankfully on the truth of the Gospel, we are really feeding on Christ. To believe is to eat. To hear or read the central truths of the Gospel, and *to accept them*, is to eat. He that comes thus to Christ shall never hunger, and he that believeth on Him shall never thirst.

The special opportunity given in the Lord's Supper, lies in the fact that here are combined all the agencies which can affect the soul. A man may hear words, without attending to them; he may see symbolic action, without reflecting on its meaning; but when, in addition to these things, he eats the bread and drinks the wine, he can hardly fail to ask himself, "Why am I doing this?" And as he does so, these words ring in his ears: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ was given for *thee*," "the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ was shed for *thee*." These are the blessed truths whereby the soul and the Saviour are brought near together.

On reviewing the whole Eucharistic controversy in the light of the Jewish sacrificial system, it has become all too plain that much misunderstanding has arisen from confusion of view about the sacrifices, and perhaps we Englishmen have been a little misled by the want of uniformity in our Authorized Version, in the translation of the ritual terms of Scripture. The words "offering" and "sacrifice" are used by us indiscriminately, but if we restricted the latter term to that class of offering which is called *Zevach* in the Old Testament, and which includes only the

Digitized by Google

sacred feasts, it would be a material help. Again, when we read of *offering* a sacrifice, the word is used indiscriminately with reference to the priest and congregation; moreover, it often signifies the "keeping" or "celebrating" of a sacrificial feast. The peculiar functions of the mediating priest are frequently misunderstood, and his position with reference to the altar and the people is ignored. We have no English name for the *Cohen*, and have been driven to adopt a word used as the title of a civil officer in the Old Testament and of a Christian minister in the New. This so-called priest is sometimes spoken of as if his special business had been to hear confessions, pronounce absolutions, and slay victims, none of which were his peculiar functions. Again, the east end of the church is often regarded as specially sacred, whereas the most holy place was at the west. The Communion Table is called an altar, whereas in the Old Dispensation the altar was in what we should now call the churchyard. To turn one's back to the people is defended by some and attacked by others as savouring of sacerdotalism, whereas the *sacerdos* took a very different position. Once more, the duties of the head of a family in the paschal supper are confounded with those of a priest at an altar, and this has been productive of much mischief.

Of all these mistakes none is more common than to call the Communion Table an altar. That the altar was called the Table of the Lord in the Old Testament is clear from Mal. i. 7 and other passages; that the Lord's Table spoken of by St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 21 refers to the Communion Table is also generally acknowledged. Why then, it may be said, not call the Lord's Table an altar? The answer is a very plain one. The mercy-seat within the veil is our one and only altar, and there, by virtue of the blood once shed and through the mediation of the one High Priest, our prayers and praises ascend to God. By the Lord's Table in 1 Cor. x. 21 we understand not God's altar, but the Table spread for us by the Lord Jesus Christ the night before He was betrayed, and whenever we have partaken of the Lord's Supper.

It cannot be concealed, moreover, that considerable negligence or ignorance exists with regard to the rite of the Lord's Supper as set forth in the New Testament. It is thought by some persons an utter profanity to partake of that Supper in the evening, and others will only take it fasting, and this in the face of the historical statements of Scripture. It is thought shocking to "administer to a rail-ful," as if our Lord when He said "Take, eat," had spoken in the singular number. Yet those very persons who wish to repeat the words to each separately, putting asunder thereby those whom the Lord joined

Digitized by Google

together, would hardly like to apply the same rule to the other Sacrament, where the questions to the sponsors, though put in the singular number, are directed to the whole body.

No customs which have crept into the Church at various ages ought to hinder us from abiding by the plain sense of Scripture. He shows most reverence to the Lord who conforms his faith and practice to the written Word. That Word, as set forth in the New Testament, must be read in the light of the Old; and the more thoroughly the Old and New Testaments are studied together in a teachable spirit, the nearer will High Churchmen and Low Churchmen approach each other both in theory and practice, and whilst approaching one another they will also be conformed to the mind of Christ.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. With a New Translation. By James G. Murphy, LL.D., F.C.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast; Author of "Commentaries on the Books of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus." Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1875.

THE readers of the *Christian Observer and Advocate* are already familiar with the name of Professor Murphy, to whose admirable "Commentary on the Book of Leviticus" we recently directed their attention.

The work before us is of a somewhat peculiar character. It aims at the combination, within the compass of one volume of moderate dimensions, of a critical, exegetical, and doctrinal Commentary on that book, which has been, in all ages, the unfailing treasury of the Church of God. The difficulties attending such an undertaking are very great; and it is no light commendation of the volume before us when we express our conviction that the writer has succeeded, in a more than ordinary degree, in meeting and overcoming them.

We are particularly impressed with the combination which Professor Murphy exhibits in this Commentary of the able and impartial critic with the orthodox and devout expositor. So far from displaying any anxiety to assign a Messianic interpretation to doubtful passages, Professor Murphy appears to us to have abandoned that interpretation, even when it is capable of defence. We may refer, for example, to his rendering of Psalm ii. 12, where he adopts the rendering of the Hebrew word *bar*, which Jerome has introduced into his Latin version of the Psalter:

Digitized by Google

viz., "purely," instead of the rendering of the authorized version, "son," which has the support of the Syriac version, and also of Jerome in his Commentary on the place, and which is supported by the use of the same word in that sense in Prov. xxxi. 2. On the other hand, in the exposition of that Psalm, and of Psalms such as the 22nd, the 45th, and the 110th, Professor Murphy adopts, in the fullest and most unambiguous manner, that Messianic interpretation which it is the aim of the negative critics to overthrow. We may refer particularly, by way of illustration, to our author's critical note upon Psalm xxii. 16,—a passage the importance of which, both on theological and critical grounds, has been felt, on both sides of rationalistic controversy, to be extremely great.

Professor Murphy inclines on the whole to regard the particular form of the word which some would render "as a lion," as a participial form in the singular number of the verb to *pierce;* and considering the piercing foretold as the act of "an individual appointed to execute the will of the assembly," he renders the latter clause of the verse thus:—

> "The assembly of malignants have enclosed me,
> Piercing my hands and my feet."

He observes that "this," which can only be said of David in a vague sense, is literally true of Christ on the cross; and he adds the following important remark:—"In ordinary circumstances of violence, the hands and the feet are not more liable to be wounded than other parts of the body; and they are more frequently cut than pierced. This makes the prophetic application the more striking."

Again: in regard to Psalm xlv., Professor Murphy observes, with justice, that whilst "the representation is no doubt derived from earthly relations, it has only a distant resemblance to any particular occasion;" and, yet further, that "the Psalm is Messianic, deriving its outward garb from the occurrences in the auspicious part of Solomon's reign." Professor Murphy's introduction to the 110th Psalm is so concise, so vigorous, and (in our judgment) so unanswerable, that we make no apology to our readers for quoting it at length.

"This Psalm is a step in advance of the second. The second celebrates the anointed of the Lord as the King on Zion, the Son of God, the Saviour and Governor of the nations: the 110th, as the Lord of David, sitting at the right hand of God, having a willing and new-born people, a Priest for ever. The former ascends from the type to the antitype: the latter begins at once with the antitype. This is merely the acme of the typical principle of interpretation. As in a single verse the antitype alone rises into view, so in a single Psalm the great archetype alone exhausts the plain meaning of the

Digitized by Google

whole. The present Psalm is of this character. David appears no longer as a type, but a subject: the Messiah appears no longer by a type, but by Himself as the eternal Priest-King. The occasion of the Psalm is not an ordinary event in the life of David, but the extraordinary event of a supernatural communication concerning the Divine nature and priestly office of the Messiah. The Psalm consists of seven verses, three before and three after the central verse, which is the key of the Psalm, determining the unique peculiarity of the King whom it celebrates. The verses before the middle verse are addressed to the Son, and the verses after to the Father."

Professor Murphy speaks with as much clearness on the evidence which the Psalms bear to the knowledge of a future state of rewards and punishments, as upon that which they contain to the person and work of the promised Messiah. He observes that the language of Psalm xvi. 10 was fulfilled only "in a relative sense" in the person of the "patriarch" David, and that the Psalm "anticipates Him who brought life and immortality to light." In like manner he remarks, in regard to Psalm xvii. 15, that the "awaking" which the Psalmist anticipated refers to the "morning of that life that reaches beyond the grave."

It may appear to some of our readers that the critical notes occupy too large a portion of a work designed for the use of general readers. Were these the only class of readers contemplated, the objection would be valid. It must be remembered, however, that Professor Murphy's work is designed for the professed Biblical student as well as for the general Biblical reader; each will find much both of interest and instruction in these most valuable and scholar-like annotations. We will add only that we cordially desire on behalf of this work a circulation corresponding to its deserts, and in that case Professor Murphy's Commentary will not be restricted to the present edition. We think that the author would do well in future editions to make a larger use of the notes contained in the "Speaker's Commentary" on the most important and most instructive portion of the Old Testament Scriptures, and more especially of the valuable Introduction which Canon Cook has prefixed to it.

OBITUARY.

JOHN ELLIOT WILSON, OF CRANBROOK.

It is rarely that we find united in one person the characteristics of an able lawyer and a profound student of theology. John Elliot Wilson, of Cranbrook, Kent, whose death is among the

Digitized by Google

records of the closing year, was a striking instance of this combination. To a mind of no ordinary power he added a love of study, which, when a young "articled clerk," induced him, it is said, to read "twice through" every book found in the small legal library to which he obtained access; and a memory of rare tenacity enabled him through life to make practical application of the knowledge he acquired.

The mind of John Elliot Wilson was eminently an *exhaustive* one. It seemed impossible for him to take a superficial view of any subject. When put before him, it would be *sounded* and viewed in every aspect before his opinion upon it could be obtained. The practice, early acquired, of minute investigation, developed into a very rapid power of comprehension. It guarded him from a one-sided view of questions requiring his legal decision, and gave weight and authority to his judgment, which were universally recognised. And this power Mr. Wilson early brought to bear upon the study of Revelation. He began to exercise himself in the "deep things" of God at a time when there were comparatively few aids to theological research. Taking the written Word, and carefully comparing Scripture with Scripture, he delighted to trace the mind and designs of God as there revealed by Himself; and especially to rejoice in the dealings of a Covenant God with His chosen people. The Old Testament as the *alone key to the New* was his peculiar study; and he deplored the comparatively small attention bestowed by ordinary readers upon this portion of the Bible. The stability given to his own faith by a diligent study of the earlier Scriptures it is impossible to estimate. While his trust in the promises was simple as the faith of a child, it was founded on the firm rock of *conviction;* and being once persuaded as to the foundations of our faith, he allowed no perplexing doubts to disturb the serenity of his confidence. What he did not comprehend, he accepted as beyond his comprehension: he was content that the mysteries of Providence should appear mysterious; and rested on the assurance that what he knew not now he should know hereafter.

It will be readily believed that such a mind would find in the study of typology a subject of intense interest. Mr. Wilson here received great assistance from the writings of the late Dr. Fairbairn, Principal of the Free College, Glasgow, with whom he formed a friendship uninterrupted in warmth for nearly nine-and-twenty years; death had the power of suspending it but for a little while.

It had been once the earnest wish of Mr. Wilson's friends that he should enter the University, with a view to ordination. He has at times regretted that circumstances did not then open the way for his doing so; but it may be questioned whether he

Digitized by Google

did not serve God as effectually in his chosen profession, as if he had been a recognised "ambassador for Christ." He was about twenty years of age when he came under the real influence of religion. From that time he determined to take as the regulating principle of his life, and as his business motto, "Seek *first* the kingdom of God, ... and all these things shall be added unto you." He accepted the command, and believed the promise. How faithfully he obeyed the one, those who were brought into business connection with John Elliot Wilson, can amply testify. Nor was he disappointed of his hope, though he never became a rich man, in the ordinary sense of the term. It is both striking and interesting when viewed in relation to that early watchword, that on the commencement of the last year of his life he selected as his new year text, the beautiful passage from 1 Cor. iii. 21—23: "All things are your's; whether ... the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are your's; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." The fulfilment of the promise seemed to have been realized in all its sufficiency.

Mr. Wilson's career as a lawyer was marked by the unvarying and implicit confidence which he commanded from all who consulted him. His knowledge of the profession was thorough and accurate; and to the clear, sound judgment, so rarely at fault, he joined a kindness of heart and thoughtful care for his clients' interests, which made one and all regard him as their friend. "No one could be brought into contact with him," wrote one who saw him daily before his death, "without being the better for the calm wisdom and gentleness which pervaded his whole character."

"If *you* are satisfied, it is enough," was the continual tribute he was receiving to the sagacity and rectitude of his opinion. "*Did I make a gain of you?*" he could ask with confidence, when, during his last illness, the transactions of his business life passed in review before his mind.

Mr. Wilson was for many years the valued Honorary Solicitor to the "Canterbury Diocesan Church Building Society," and the "Canterbury Diocesan Board of Education," and deeply felt resigning these appointments, when failing health at length compelled his doing so.

It is not as the record of an eventful life, that this little sketch is drawn up. The life of John Elliot Wilson was that of a man whose mental power could never fail to be acknowledged; and who, while engaged in active and anxious occupation, put the study and the practice of God's Word before everything else. It was his constant rejoicing that, during the busiest portion of his life, he could entirely banish business associations on the Lord's Day. In early life, and while health and strength allowed of it,

Digitized by Google

Mr. Wilson made a practice of going out at seven o'clock on Sunday morning, to visit and teach to read some poor men whom he could not reach at other times. He would twice in the day take a class in the Sunday School; and after the second service in church, was long accustomed to walk a distance of five miles to his father's house at Hawkhurst, where he would take a Bible-class in the Boys' School, over which his father presided. On several evenings in the week he would, at the end of a long day's work, spend two hours in a Night School which he had organised, and for which he himself paid a regular master. He delighted in teaching the seventy or eighty men of all ages, who from a small village would be assembled together; and up to the few last months of his life, he was receiving most pleasing testimony as to the benefits of his instruction.

Mr. Wilson was a firmly-attached member of the Church of England, and was earnest in trying to give to the labouring classes an intelligent view of the doctrines of the Church, of her Prayer-book, her Articles, her Catechism. In all societies connected with the advancement of God's kingdom upon earth he took the warmest interest; but the Church Missionary and the Bible Societies were those nearest his heart, and their cause he most strongly advocated in his own neighbourhood.

In so brief a sketch it is not possible to give an adequate idea of this earnest and devoted life. The church and schools, the poor and suffering in his own parish were largely indebted to him. To young men entering on life he proved a warm and judicious friend. He knew when to give advice, and how to give it; and there are not a few to testify now that they owe an honourable position to Mr. Wilson's early counsel and assistance.

During the last years of his life his general health was greatly impaired; but his mental power never failed him, nor was his sweetness of temper and disposition ever ruffled by illness. It was said by one who knew him well, that had the thirteenth chapter of the first of Corinthians been written to describe John Elliot Wilson, it could hardly have done so more exactly.

He died on the 7th of June, after a week of severe illness, unattended by much suffering. On Sunday, the 30th of May, he was downstairs for the last time. On that day he observed, in anticipation of a London physician's visit, that, let the result be what it might, it was "well" with him; and that if taken away, he was "but taken home."

He then referred to the sixth verse of the first chapter of Ephesians: "To the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved," and compared it with Zechariah iv. 7: "He shall bring forth the head-stone

Digitized by Google

thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it." Observing how needful and, at times, how difficult it is to realize that salvation is from beginning to end a free gift of grace alone.

On his death-bed there was a longing to "see the King in His beauty," and though he had dreaded the last encounter, and had spoken with shrinking of the "pains of death," it was only in apparently a gentle sleep that he passed away. His last, scarcely audible, words gave an assurance that he was leaning on the Saviour whom he had loved and served.

Few men have passed through life so blamelessly as John Elliot Wilson. Few have desired more earnestly to act upon the precept, "Walk before Me, and be thou perfect;" but his hope "full of immortality," was founded completely and alone on the "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction" of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Life of Erasmus, by the Rev. Arthur Pennington. London: Seeley, 1875.—It is not unnatural that when the principles of the Reformation are called in question, and there are symptoms of a tendency to revert to the superstitions of the middle ages, that fresh inquiry should be made into the character and motives of those by whom the intellects and consciences of men in the sixteenth century were delivered from the thraldom of Rome. Among the most conspicious of these was the celebrated scholar and wit, Erasmus: his literary labours, judged by the standard of our own degenerate days, were enormous, and the more wonderful as the product of one who was perpetually struggling against ceaseless bodily suffering; but he was most formidable by the shrewdness of his wit. He was no infidel, as Gibbon was; but his sneer was as solemn, and more demolishing, as it had more fitting material to work upon. The reversion which has taken place by partizans of all sorts to Reformation times has therefore been fertile in lives and sketches of the life of this distinguished man. Among these the careful labours of Mr. Pennington will hold a conspicuous place. He has produced a most interesting volume, which will be perused with pleasure by the ordinary reader, and will be most welcome to those who have some familiarity with the times in which Erasmus lived, and with the scenes in which he was so remarkable an actor. There is no attempt at undue extenuation of the vacillating policy of Erasmus with regard to the Reformation. Mr. Pennington has delineated him fairly, in his weakness as well as in his strength, and has given a just account of both. The volume teems with information on the times in which Erasmus lived: sometimes in lively sketches by himself, sometimes judiciously gathered from his works.

Digitized by Google

No intelligent reader will, we think, if he can help it, put the volume aside before he has finished it. We earnestly recommend it to all who seek for profit as well as amusement in the books they read. They will find both in Mr. Pennington's life of this remarkable man. The Bishop of Lincoln in his preface speaks of it as "a book seasonable at the present time;" an opinion in which we most heartily concur.

The Last Three Sermons Preached at Oxford by P. N. Shuttleworth, D.D., afterwards Bishop of Chichester. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875.—Chichester has of late years been unfortunate in her Bishops. To some scandal attached; some have been inefficient, or worse than inefficient. The most valuable have been short-lived. Among these last have been Bishop Shuttleworth. It is with no small interest that we have perused these his latest public utterances at Oxford. They are full of sound Scriptural truth upon important topics, with special reference to the Tractarian movement, the then error of the day. We are glad to find that they have been republished, for unfortunately the wholesome warnings they contain are as much needed now as they were when the sermons were first written. Justification through faith, the merciful character of the Gospel covenant, and the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith, are treated of in these masterly discourses, and that with no uncertain sound. A brief but most sensible letter to a young clergyman who had joined the Church of Rome, is added. The Bishop did not live to see the development of Ritualism, but of even what he witnessed his judgment was that it was "folly too great to last." What he did dread was "the reign of infidelity, which will certainly be the result." Of effective absolution in the hands of the clergy, he declares, "The New Testament contains no such doctrine, nor was it taught even by those occasional unsound men, the early Fathers." On the Lord's Supper he says, "Our Saviour speaks of no *sacrifice*, but of a commemorative rite: 'Do this in remembrance of Me.'" It is vain to speculate what might have been the condition of the Chichester diocese, had the life of this sensible and excellent man been spared. *Deo aliter visum.*

Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875.—The tenth edition within nine years of a poem in twelve books, of a religious character, is, quite apart from the merit of the work, a pleasing incident to record. In the midst of all the frivolity and licentiousness of the day, an assurance is thus furnished that there are still many devout and godly persons who delight in meditating upon the solemn questions relating to eternity, which have been so ably treated by Mr. Bickersteth in his poem. We accept the augury with hope and confidence, and meanwhile congratulate the author on his well-merited success.

English History for the use of Schools. By the Rev. T. Franck Bright, M.A., etc. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1875.—One distinct benefit resulting from the recent efforts made in our Universities and public schools, to excite increased attention to modern history and literature, has been the great improvement in school-books and manuals upon these subjects. All classes of the

Digitized by Google

community, and both sexes, will reap the benefit of this change. Sound and reliable information, procured from authentic sources, has taken the place of what may not unfairly be termed legends, which had hitherto met with unquestioning acceptance. Among these manuals Mr. Bright's English History promises to hold a conspicuous position. We say promises, because hitherto only the first part, embracing our Mediæval Monarchy, from 449 to 1485, has been published. We have looked it through carefully, and can vouch that it has treated the period in a judicious and satisfactory manner. It has the merit of being readable as well as instructive, and is not disfigured by needless archaisms, which are very repellent to young folk. If the work, which will be issued in three parts, is concluded with the same careful moderation and judgment which we observe in this part, it will form a very valuable addition to our school literature.

The Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Offerings of Israel. With Illustrations. By the Rev. Frederick Whitfield, M.A. London: Seeley. 1875.—Much and at various times has been written concerning the matters of which this volume treats, from the inspired delineations contained in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, down to the very humble contributions meant to arouse the minds of children, and to interest them in the great ordinances foreshadowing and typifying the Lord Jesus Christ. Often, however, as the subject has been handled, there is in this abundant harvest-field something yet to be gleaned, and every fresh inquirer who approaches it in a humble and reverent spirit, finds that he can add his quota to the fund of information already accumulated. We can fairly congratulate Mr. Whitfield on having produced some very interesting studies, which will be found most profitable for family reading. With care and skill the correspondence between type and antitype has been preserved. Many familiar thoughts are preserved, and some new ones are suggested. The volume is full of our Lord Jesus Christ. Instead of dry disquisitions upon the tabernacle and the priesthood of Israel, the full beauty and deep significance of them are brought into a full view in a very lucid and striking manner. It will furnish most wholesome food for spiritually-minded Christians, and will be most instructive to those who are lacking knowledge. We quite agree with Mr. Whitfield in his view of the importance of the study of the Old Testament, in order fully to appreciate the New. It is most satisfactory to find that so adequate a successor has been found to the much lamented and much beloved Mr. Vores of Hastings.

Tropical Nature.—Stories from China.—The Land of the Lion.—Half Hours with the Animals.—Goatland.—Will Foster of the Ferry.—Little Rosy's Pets. London: Seeley. 1875. Christmas is at hand. With Christmas young folk will be thronging home to parents and friends,—except where there are no homes for them, those who most love them being in far distant lands. In anticipation of this return to "Dulce Domum," publishers are busy in catering and preparing appropriate gifts. An instalment of these has reached us from Messrs. Seeley. "Tropical Nature," which is described as an

Digitized by Google

account of the most remarkable phenomena of life in the Western Tropics, is an exceedingly handsome and instructive volume, profusely illustrated. The information contained in it has been carefully compiled, and will be well adapted as a present for young persons of some age and considerable intelligence. "Stories from China" furnishes very useful instruction for children about that most interesting country: while supplying copious details about the mode of Chinese life, Christian effort on behalf of the people is not lost sight of, though it is not a missionary publication. It has many illustrations. The two books next on our list may be grouped together. "The Land of the Lion" will be most attractive to boys fond of adventure, and in whom the passion for hunting is already developing itself. It is full of startling incidents, not only about lions, but about deer and crocodiles and falcons and the other wild denizens of Africa. "Half Hours with the Animals" is a collection of tales about horses, dogs, cats, monkeys, mostly illustrative of the marvellous instinct often displayed by them, and of their affection for man when treated with kindness. Both books abound with illustrations. "Goatland" is a tale of country life. A sickly town lad is transported into a country vicarage, where he regains health. It is full of rural incidents, which will be pleasant reading for small folk "in populous cities pent." "Will Foster" is by Miss Giberne, and is, if we mistake not, a reprint from a periodical. It deserves the reissue, for like all this lady's writings it contains not only pleasant but wholesome reading, teaching Christian faith and resignation. "Little Rosy's Pets" is very small gear for very small people, but to them it will, we think, be very attractive, with its quaint illustrations and large type.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE chief interest of Englishmen in public affairs during the past month has probably centered in the Imperial progress which the Prince of Wales is making through our Eastern dominions. It has of course been pleasant to be informed by Mr. D'Israeli that there is no longer apprehension of a war with China; and as for the Eastern Question, both curiosity and anxiety must (if possible) be restrained until Parliament meets, unless some unforseen conjunction precipitates events. In the absence of these topics for excitement, feelings of loyalty and sympathy are aroused, and prayers are offered for the young Prince who is now meeting face to face with great feudatories of our Empire: while they, instead of dreaming of that old abstraction "*Company Bahadur*," and puzzling themselves over what a Chairman and Directors might be, have before them the much more intelligible

Digitized by Google

presentment of a royal Prince. All the accounts which have hitherto reached England testify to an enthusiastic reception of the heir-apparent of the Crown; and we may fain hope that this visit will do much to strengthen the allegiance of our fellow-subjects in the East.

At home there has been much distress caused during the month now closing by most persistent currents of rain, causing terrible floods in almost all parts of the country. There has been great destruction of valuable property; and all farming operations have been brought to a stand-still, even in quarters where the deluge of rain has not, as in low-lying lands, been destructive. We may notice with satisfaction the final withdrawal of the obnoxious Admiralty Circular relating to fugitive slaves; and passing mention may be made of the fact that in place of our ancient Courts of Law, the Supreme Court of Judicature has commenced its sittings in a five-fold division corresponding to the former system.

France has been chiefly concerned with the meeting of its Assembly, and with anxious deliberations upon the Electoral Law, and the mode of voting by which a new Assembly, which must shortly be convened, is to be called into existence. Questions relative to University Education occupy much of the attention both of Liberal and Clerical politicians.

In Germany the King of Bavaria has seriously displeased the Ultramontane party of his subjects by severe comments upon the excesses to which they proceeded in the Chamber of Deputies. The address of the Chamber was rejected, and the sittings of the Chamber were summarily prorogued.

In Turkey the aspect of affairs is still more gloomy than it was. The financial condition of the country is apparently hopeless; Russia has declared that justice must be done to the Christian subjects of the Porte; the insurrection in the Herzegovina is not yet suppressed; nor unless the European powers intervene is there a prospect of its restoration to tranquility. In the Malay Peninsula there have been disturbances, involving the murder of the British resident, Mr. Birch.

During the last month the venerable Dr. M'Neile has felt himself constrained to resign the Deanery of Ripon in consequence of advancing age: he will carry with him into his retirement from active life the affectionate regards of all Evangelical Christians, at the close of a life wherein he has been in useful labours "most abundant." Mr. Burgon, of St. Mary's, Oxford, is to replace Dr. Hook at Chichester: the appointment will be readily welcomed as most judicious and opportune, although the new Dean "followeth not with us."

Digitized by Google

INDEX

OF THE

ESSAYS, SUBJECTS, INTELLIGENCE, OCCURRENCES,

&c., &c., &c.

A Plea for the Supernatural in Joshua X., 780.
Address to our Readers, 1.
American Revivalists in London, 399, 479, 559.
Appeal for the Establishment of an Institution for the Theological Training of the Clergy, 522.
Arnim, Count, trial of, 79.
Baptism, on, 3.
Believer, the; Complete, yet Incomplete, 321.
Champneys Dean, in Memoriam, 231.
Christ, the Covenanted Presence of, 448.
Christian Ministry, the Principles of the, with reference to the Circumstances of the Day, 641.
Christmas Books, 70.
Churchmen, the Duty of Honest and Loyal, in the Present Crisis, 92.
Church of England: is it worth preserving? 653.
Church Congress at Stoke-upon-Trent, 879.
Clergy, Appeal for the Establishment of an Institution for the Theological Preparation of, 522.
Clergy, the Professional Instruction of the, 580.
Conference of Evangelical Members of the Church of England, 238.
Confession and Absolution, 161.
Convocation, Meeting of, 399.
———— Proceedings of, 639.
Cornwall, in its Religious Aspect, 195.
CORRESPONDENCE:—
On Worship, 313.
Comforter or Advocate, 793.
Latent Scepticism, 395.
Disestablishment, Four Years' Experience of, 24, 113, 215.
East India (Famine), 667.
Edinburgh Review, and M. Renan, 275, 373, 463.
Elliott, Rev. E. B., death of, 720, 787.
Episcopate, Increase of the, 319.
Error, the Attractions of, 401.
Evangelical Churchmen, Relation of, to Currents of Religious Thought, 598.
Evangelical Principles: Baptism, 3; Worship, 81; Confession and Absolution, 161.
Exeter Reredos Case, 320.
Forgery the Basis of the Papal Power, 589.
France, State of Affairs in, 160, 240, 320, 560, 640, 799.
Hook, Dr., Death of, 880.
In Memoriam, Rev. E. B. Elliott, 787.
Irish Church, Proceedings of the Synod, 399, 480.
Jews, the Sacrificial System of the, 296, 382, 454, 539, 614, 697, 771, 865, 926.
Joshua X., a Plea for the Supernatural in, 780.
Liddon, Canon, and Monsignor Capel, 159.
Manning, Dr., created Cardinal, 399.
May Meetings, 479.
Missions, and the Best Mode of Conducting Them, 801.
Notices of Books, 75, 154, 234, 314, 396, 475, 556, 634, 715, 796, 876, 944.
O'Brien, Bishop, Death of, 80.
Papal Power, Forgery the Basis of, 589.
Parliament, Meeting of, 238.
———— Proceedings of, 319, 398, 479, 559, 638, 719.
POETRY:—
Churchyard Thoughts: a fragment, 392.
Preaching to the Uneducated, 721.

Digitized by Google

Public Affairs, 79, 159, 238, 319, 398, 479, 559, 638, 719, 799, 879, 947.
Reviews :—
Autobiography of Thomas Guthrie, 573.
Bailey's Life of Thomas Fuller, 100.
Biography of James Everett, 226.
Champneys' Quiet Corner of England, 87.
Charge of the Bishop of Bombay, 532.
Christmas Books, 70.
Clerical Policy of the 19th Century, 203.
Cox's Expositor's Note Book, 310.
Garbett's Obligations of Truth in Religious Controversy, 764.
Glennie's Pilgrim Memories, 693.
Godet's Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, 707.
Goulburn's and Kingdon's Fasting Communion, etc., 410.
Hare's Days near Rome, 267.
History of a Bengal Raiyat, 486.
Hübner's Promenade Autour du Monde, 327.
Jackson's Philosophy of Natural Religion, 686.
Kalisch on Leviticus, 54.
Kinglake's Battle of Inkerman, 420.
Lightfoot's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to Colossians and Philemon, 860.
Livingstone's last Journals, 14.
McClellan's Translation of the New Testament, 549.
MacColl's Letters on the Lawlessness of Ritualism, 507.
Mansel's Gnostic Heresies, 438.
Memoir of Bishop Daly, 171.
Menan's Babylone et la Chaldée, 368.
Mill's Nature, the Utility of Religion, and Theism, 40.
Murphy on the Psalms, 938.
New Reformation, by Theodorus, 911.
Pearsall Smith's Holiness through Faith, 830.
Pilgrim Hymns, 210.
Rest on the Seventh Day, 881.
Supernatural Religion: an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation, 177.
Swainson's History of the Creeds, 728, 808.
Tennyson's Queen Mary, 761.
The Greville Memoirs, 122.
The Greatest of the Prophets, 51.
The Speaker's Commentary, Vol. V., 750, 900.
Works on Ritual Controversy, 246, 342.
Revision of our Authorised Version, on the proposed, 620.
Ritual Controversy, 246, 342.
Ritualism, the lawlessness of, 507.
Ritualists at their Devotions, 140.
Sanctification, 481.
Scepticism, latent, 289.
Self-consecration, 429.
Sermons, 667.
Spain, state of Affairs in, 160, 240, 399, 880.
Supernatural Religion, 177, 888.
The Believer's Standing, 241.
The Word, 561.
Thirlwall, Bishop, death of, 720.
Tyndall, Professor, 841.
Vores, Rev. T., death of, 880.
Wales, Prince of, visit to India, 879.
Willis, Professor, death of, 320.
Wilson, John Elliot, In Memoriam.
Worship, on, 81.
Zanzibar, Sultan of, visit to England, 560, 640.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO PRINCIPAL NAMES.

Adams, Rev. W., 157.
Alford, Dean, 76.
Bailey, Mr. J. E., 100.
Bardsley, Rev. J., 247, 342.
Barker, Lady, 155.
Barlee, Miss, 156.
Baring, Bp., 479.
Barr, Rev. J., 798.
Bell, Rev. C. D., 397.
Bennett, Rev. J. E., 654.
Birks, Prof., 77.
Bickersteth, Archd., 247 342.
Bickersteth, Rev. E. H., 315.
Bonar, Dr., 72, 76.
Brock, Mrs. Carey, 70.
Buckle, H. T., 694.
Bullock, Rev. C., 74.
Burgon, Rev. T. W., 948.
Calthrop, Rev. G., 396.
Capel, Monsignor, 140, 159.
Carter, Rev. T., 933.
Champneys, Dean, 231.
Champneys, Mr. Basil, 87.
Chew, Richard, 227.
Clowes, Rev. J., 78.
Cook, Rev. F. C., 750.
Cosin, Bp., 246, 342.
Cox, Rev. Samuel, 210, 310.
Crakanthorp, Dr., 769.
Curteis, Rev. A. M., 397.
Dallas, Rev. A., 876.
Daly, Dr., 171.
Dollinger, Dr., 912.
Douglas, Bp., 532.
Droop, Mr. H. R., 507.
Edersheim, Dr., 557.
Elliott, Rev. E. B., 287, 382, 720, 787.
Erasmus, 944.
Everett, James, 226.
Ewald, Prof., 480.
Fairbairn, Prof., 637.
Freeman, Archd., 297, 936.
Fosbery, Rev. T. V., 877.
Fuller, Dr. Thomas, 100.
Garbett, Rev. E., 70, 764.
Garland, Rev. G. V., 797.
Giberne, Miss Agnes, 71, 556.
Gifford, Dr., 317.
Girdlestone, Rev. R. B., 310, 392.
Gladstone, Mr. W. E., 159, 653, 877.
Glennie, Rev. J. S., 693.
Godet, Prof., 707.
Goodhart, Rev. J. C, 469.
Goulburn, Dean, 246, 342, 410, 635, 722.
Gray, Rev. C. N., 767.
Gregg, Dr., 223.
Greville, C. C. J., Esq., 122.
Griffith, Rev. J., 396.
Guthrie, Rev. Dr., 573.
Hare, Augustus J. C. 267.
Hatchard, Mrs. G., 796.
Hayman, Mr. S., 158.
Hoare, Rev. Canon, 241.
Hook, Dr., 880.
Hope, A. J. B. Beresford, 246, 257, 342.
Hübner, Baron, 328, 668.
Jackson, Rev. W., 686.
Jacobson, Bp., 246.
Jelf, Rev. W. E., 475.
Kalisch, Dr., 84.
Kay, Dr., 750, 900.
King, Canon, 931.
King, Mr. R. J., 237.
Kingdon, Rev. H. T., 410.
Kinglake, A. W., 420.
Kingsley, Rev. C., 240.
Krummacher, Dr., 557.
Lal, Behari Day, Rev., 486.
Lee, Dr. F. C., 764.
Liddon, Canon, 140, 159, 480, 912, 930.
Lightfoot, Prof., 181, 438, 531, 860, 899.
Littledale, Dr., 346, 930.
Livingstone, David, 14.
Lockwood, Mr., 236.
McClellan, Rev. J. B., 549.
MacColl, Rev. M., 507.
Macaulay, Dr., 715.
Macduff, Dr., 71.
Mackonochie, Mr., 80, 655, 720.
Madden, Mrs., Hamilton 171.
Manning Dr., 399.
Mansel, Dean, 438.
Marriott, Mr. W., 346, 933.
Marshall, Dr., 168.
Mayers, Rev. M. J., 396.
Ménant, M., 368.
Mill, John Stuart, 40, 181.
Monsell, Dr., 798.
Moody and Sankey, Messrs., 399, 559.
Murphy, Dr. J. G., 54, 65, 938.
Niven, Rev. W., 557.
Nordhoff, Charles, 154.
Northbrook, Lord, 670, 686.
O'Brien, Bp., 80.
Parnell, Rev. F., 718.
Patteson, Bp., 235,
Pennington, Rev. I., 944.
Power, Rev. P. B., 155.
Prosser, Mrs., 557.
Pusey, Dr., 141, 157, 480, 655.
Radcliffe, Mr., 236.
Raglan, Lord, 427.
Reichel, Dr., 845.
Renan, M., 275, 373, 463.
Reynolds, Dr., 477.
Richardson, Rev. John, 314.
Roberts, Mr. W., 75.
Robertson, Rev. J. C., 716.
Row, Rev. C. A., 686.
Ryle, Rev. J. C., 878.

Digitized by Google

Sanderson, Bp., 246, 342.
Savile, Rev. B. W., 558.
Scholefield, Prof., 314.
Selwyn, Canon, 249, 342.
Seymour, Rev. Hobart 163, 621.
Shaw, Morton, 247, 343.
Sherring, Rev. M. A., 717.
Shipley, Rev. O., 75, 142, 878.
Shuttleworth, Bp., 945.
Sinclair, Archd., 234.
Smith, Dean Payne, 900.
Smith, Rev. H. H. A., 798.
Smith, Mr. R. Pearsall, 559, 830.
Stanley, Dean, 61.
Stanley, Mr., 23.
Stuart, Glennie, M.P., 693.
Swainson, Dr., 247, 343, 728, 797, 808.
Temple, Sir R., 682.
Tennyson, Alfred, 761.
Thirlwall, Bp., 527, 720.
Tripp, Rev. R. H., 396.
Tyndall, Prof., 841.
Victorinus, 763.
Von Sybel, Prof., 203
Vores, Rev. T., 880.
Wallace, Prof., 845.
Waller, Mr. Horace, 14.
Walsh, Dean, 158.
Whately, Archbp., 157.
Wheatstone, Sir C., 880.
Whitfield, Rev. F., 946.
Willis, Prof., 320.
Wilson, Dr., 805.
Wilson, J. E., 941.
Wilton, Rev. R., 478.
Winslow, Dr., 157.
Wolfe, Rev. A., 247, 343.
Wolsley, Sir Garnet, 238.
Wood, Rev. J. G., 70.
Wren, Bp., 246, 342.
Zanchius, 511.

INDEX TO SIGNATURES OF CORRESPONDENTS.

A. B., 314.
A Layman, 203.
E. J. J., 573.
Elliott, E. B., 287, 382, 473.
Garbett, Edward, 653.
Girdlestone, R. B., 310,
Girdlestone, 392, 463, 548, 620, 767, 780, 876.
Goe, F. F., 796.
H. C. G. M., 395.
H. S. E., 727.
Harrison, W., 171.
J. F. T., 808.
Richardson, John, 87, 410.
Savile, B. W., 859.
Seymour, M. Hobart, 634.
Smith, R. Payne, 14.
Tripp, R. H., 396.

LONDON: WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google